

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Hans N. Smith to be postmaster at South Windham, Mass., in place of John C. Nichols, resigned.

## MISSOURI.

C. W. Culley to be postmaster at Bunceton, Mo., in place of Clarence M. Zeigle, resigned.

## NEW JERSEY.

George N. Wimer to be postmaster at Palmyra, N. J., in place of Arthur Winner. Incumbent's commission expired March 2, 1911.

## NEW YORK.

George A. Duck to be postmaster at Great Neck Station, N. Y. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1911.

Arthur J. Wilson to be postmaster at Downsville, N. Y. Office becomes presidential July 1, 1911.

## OREGON.

Jay P. Lucas to be postmaster at Hood River, Oreg., in place of William M. Yates, resigned.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

J. Frank Kneee to be postmaster at Batesburg, S. C., in place of J. Frank Kneee. Incumbent's commission expired December 19, 1910.

## TENNESSEE.

Henry F. Ferguson to be postmaster at Centerville, Tenn., in place of James S. Beasley, resigned.

Robert P. Sulte to be postmaster at Rockwood, Tenn., in place of William F. Millican. Incumbent's commission expired January 18, 1911.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Richard A. Hall to be postmaster at Weston, W. Va., in place of Richard A. Hall. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1910.

## WISCONSIN.

Frank H. Marshall to be postmaster at Kilbourn, Wis., in place of Frank H. Marshall. Incumbent's commission expired February 12, 1911.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 1911.*

## DEPUTY COMMISSIONER OF FISHERIES.

Hugh M. Smith to be deputy commissioner in the Bureau of Fisheries.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

## CAVALRY ARM.

Capt. Francis H. Beach to be major.  
First Lieut. Robert M. Nolan to be captain.  
First Lieut. William O. Reed to be captain.  
Second Lieut. Roy W. Holderness to be first lieutenant.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. George W. Cocheu to be captain.

## INFANTRY ARM.

Maj. John F. Morrison to be lieutenant colonel.  
Capt. Vernon A. Caldwell to be major.  
Capt. Edmund L. Butts to be major.  
Maj. William H. Sage to be lieutenant colonel.  
Capt. Henry J. Hunt to be major.  
Second Lieut. Richard B. Pickering to be first lieutenant.  
Second Lieut. Lowe A. McClure to be first lieutenant.  
Second Lieut. Charles F. Conry to be first lieutenant.  
Second Lieut. Clement H. Wright to be first lieutenant.  
Second Lieut. William R. Scott to be first lieutenant.  
Second Lieut. William W. Harris, jr., to be first lieutenant.

## MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Henry P. Birmingham to be colonel.  
Maj. Henry C. Fisher to be lieutenant colonel.  
Capt. Cosam J. Bartlett to be major.

*To be captains.*

First Lieut. John R. Barber.  
First Lieut. Joseph A. Worthington.  
First Lieut. Mahlon Ashford.  
First Lieut. Edward G. Huber.  
First Lieut. John S. Lambie, jr.  
First Lieut. Arthur N. Tasker.  
First Lieut. Howard McC. Snyder.  
First Lieut. Calvin D. Cowles, jr.  
First Lieut. Garfield L. McKinney.  
First Lieut. Hiram A. Phillips.

## PAY DEPARTMENT.

Maj. Thomas C. Goodman, paymaster, to be Deputy Paymaster General, with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

## APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Horace T. Aplington, Infantry, to be second lieutenant.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

## MEDICAL RESERVE CORPS.

*To be first lieutenants.*

Thomas Crooke McCleave.  
Homer Clifton Moses.  
George Louis Painter.  
Louis Austin Bolling.  
Arthur Alexander Finch.  
William Henry Lloyd.  
Chalmers Melancthon Van Poole.  
Raymond Carl Andries.  
Francis Theodore Buechli Fest.  
Louis Alexander Greensfelder.  
Neal Luther Hoskins.  
James Wooffendale Inches.  
Lawrence Lee.  
Hiram Rittenhouse Loux.  
Alexander Johnston MacKenzie.  
William Jason Mixer.  
Robert Albert Carl Wollenberg.  
Richard Mills Pearce, jr.  
Frederick Casimir Simon.  
William Norwood Souter.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Edward Simpson to be a captain.  
Medical Inspector James E. Gardner to be a medical director.  
Machinist Frederick H. Richwien to be a chief machinist.  
Lieut. Henry E. Lackey to be a lieutenant commander.  
Lieut. Frederick J. Horne to be a lieutenant commander.  
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward S. Robinson to be a lieutenant.  
Lieut. (Junior Grade) Benjamin H. Steele to be a lieutenant.  
Machinist John R. Likens to be a chief machinist.

## POSTMASTERS.

## MASSACHUSETTS.

Austin E. Stearns, Conway.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

J. A. Meyer, New England.  
C. E. Styer, Crosby.

## OHIO.

Frank M. Kain, Batavia.  
William J. Lockheart, Bellville.

## UTAH.

William W. Wilson, Sandy.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Harry H. Bodley, Elm Grove.

## SENATE.

*WEDNESDAY, June 28, 1911.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.  
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. 117, A) memorializing Congress, in enacting cold-storage legislation, not to limit the time during which said dairy products can be stored to less than one year.

Whereas Wisconsin is the leading dairy State in the Union, and its farmers are vitally interested in everything pertaining to that industry, having over \$5,000,000 invested in buildings and equipments, and \$55,000,000 in cows and other equipment necessary to carry on the dairy industry; and

Whereas if such legislation is enacted the farmers of Wisconsin, who have large amounts of money invested in the dairy business, will have their market destroyed, owing to the fact that a large proportion of their products is made in a few months of the year, and if said legislation is enacted the market for butter will be destroyed, with a consequent lessening of production resulting in a shortage and too high a price in winter; and

Whereas it has been proven that butter held in cold storage is not detrimental to the health of the consumer: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States, in enacting cold-storage legislation, not to limit the time during which said dairy products can be stored to less than one year.*

C. A. INGRAM,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
THOMAS MORRIS,  
President of the Senate.  
C. E. SHAFFER,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.  
F. M. WYLIE,  
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a telegram, in the nature of resolutions adopted by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, in annual session at Los Angeles, Cal., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the pure food and drug law making it unlawful for any false statement to appear upon labels, circulars, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 148, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hooksett, N. H., and a memorial of Bear Hill Grange, No. 39, Patrons of Husbandry, of Henniker, N. H. remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McLEAN presented a memorial of Local Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Norwich, Conn., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Business Men's Association of Hartford, Conn., praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of New Haven, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CUMMINS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Ellsworth and Renwick, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented a memorial of Local Grange No. 1132, Patrons of Husbandry, of Susquehanna Valley, N. Y., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Local Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Mechanicsville, N. Y., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KERN presented a memorial of the Indiana Grain Dealers' Association, remonstrating against a ruling of the Post Office Department relative to trade journals and magazines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Automobile Manufacturers, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2768) to authorize the St. Louis-Kansas City Electric Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the town of Weldon Springs Landing, Mo., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 90) thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2911) to increase the limit of cost for the erection of the United States post-office building at Morgantown, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 2912) granting an increase of pension to Robert Posey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 2913) granting a pension to Frances M. Swift (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER (by request):

A bill (S. 2914) making an appropriation for the purchase of mural decorations for the new building for the Department of State; to the Committee on the Library.

#### PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS.

Mr. McLEAN. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read at length and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Congress shall have the power to protect migratory birds, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following be proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States:*

#### ARTICLE XVII.

SECTION 1. Congress shall have power to protect migratory birds and prohibit and regulate the killing thereof.

SEC. 2. Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

#### AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURNHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12109) to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1911, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. HEYBURN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 88), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at a salary of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided for by law.*

#### ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION.

Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. NIXON) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands is hereby authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at a salary of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided for by law.*

#### ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BURTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department is hereby authorized to employ an assistant clerk, at a salary of \$1,800 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided for by law.*

#### RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. PENROSE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the reciprocity bill, House bill 4412.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Cummins	McCumber	Smith, Mich.
Bradley	Curtis	McLean	Smith, S. C.
Briggs	Dixon	Martin, Va.	Smoot
Eristow	du Pont	Nelson	Stone
Brown	Foster	Newlands	Sutherland
Bryau	Gore	O'Gorman	Swanson
Burnham	Gronna	Oliver	Taylor
Burton	Guggenheim	Overman	Thornton
Chilton	Heyburn	Page	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Hitchcock	Penrose	Watson
Crane	Johnson, Me.	Perkins	Works
Crawford	Kern	Pomerene	
Culberson	La Follette	Shively	
Cullom	Lippitt	Simmons	

Mr. THORNTON. I wish to state that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. JOHNSTON] is absent in attendance upon the Lorimer investigating committee.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. WARREN] is unavoidably absent from the city.

Mr. PAGE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM] is absent in connection with his duties upon the Lorimer investigating committee.

Mr. STONE. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] has been unexpectedly and necessarily called from the city.



Mr. GORE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. OWEN] is absent from the city. This announcement will stand for the day.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. LEA] is not present because he is ill.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is in attendance upon the Lorimer investigating committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4412) to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer certain amendments to the pending bill. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with their reading at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are they offered as several amendments or as one amendment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I offer them together, reserving the right to ask for a division of the question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa to dispense with the reading? The Chair hears none.

The amendments submitted by Mr. CUMMINS are as follows: On page 2 of the bill strike out lines 1 to 18, inclusive, as follows:

Fresh meats—Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats excepting game, 1½ cents per pound.

Bacon and hams, not in tins or jars, 1½ cents per pound.

Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner, not otherwise herein provided for, 1½ cents per pound.

Canned meats and canned poultry, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Extract of meat, fluid or not, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Lard and compounds thereof, cottonseed oil and cotton seed, and animal tallow, 1½ cents per pound.

Tallow, 40 cents per 100 pounds.

Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen, 7½ per cent ad valorem.

Strike out from line 5, on page 3, to line 16, on page 4, the following words:

Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other airtight packages, and including the weight of the package, 1½ cents per pound.

Wheat flour and semolina and rye flour, 50 cents per barrel of 196 pounds.

Oatmeal and rolled oats, including the weight of paper covering, 50 cents per 100 pounds.

Corn meal, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.

Barley malt, 45 cents per 100 pounds.

Barley, pot, pearled, or patent, one-half cent per pound.

Buckwheat flour or meal, one-half cent per pound.

Split peas, dried, 7½ cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

Prepared cereal foods, not otherwise provided for herein, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Bran, middlings, and other offals of grain used for animal food, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.

Macaroni and vermicelli, 1 cent per pound.

Biscuits, wafers, and cakes, when sweetened with sugar, honey, molasses, or other material, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Biscuits, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, composed in whole or in part of eggs or any kind of flour or meal, when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruits, or confectionery; also candied peel, candied popcorn, candied nuts, candied fruits, sugar candy, and confectionery of all kinds, 32½ per cent ad valorem.

Maple sugar and maple sirup, 1 cent per pound.

Pickles, including pickled nuts, sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce, 32½ per cent ad valorem.

Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juices and fruit sirup, nonalcoholic, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Strike out from line 24, page 4, to line 13, page 5, the following words:

Farm wagons and finished parts thereof, 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Plows, tooth and disk harrows, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-drawn, cultivators; threshing machines, including windstackers, baggers, weighers, and self-feeders thereof and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Portable engines with boilers, in combination, horsepower and traction engines for farm purposes; hay loaders, potato diggers, fodder or feed cutters, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm or field rollers, manure spreaders, weeders, and windmills, and finished parts thereof imported for repair of the foregoing, except shafting, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Strike out from line 3, page 6, to line 4, page 7, the following words:

Asbestos, further manufactured than ground; manufactures of asbestos or articles of which asbestos is the component material of chief value, including woven fabrics, wholly or in chief value of asbestos, 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Printing ink, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Cutlery, plated or not, pocketknives, penknives, scissors and shears, knives and forks for household purposes, and table steels, 27½ per cent ad valorem.

Bells and gongs, brass corners and rules for printers, 27½ per cent ad valorem.

Basins, urinals, and other plumbing fixtures for bathrooms and lavatories; bathtubs, sinks, and laundry tubs of earthenware, stone, cement, or clay, or of other material, 32½ per cent ad valorem.

Brass band instruments, 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Clocks, watches, time recorders, clock and watch keys, clock cases, and clock movements, 27½ per cent ad valorem.

Printers' wooden cases and cabinets for holding type, 27½ per cent ad valorem.

Wood flour, 22½ per cent ad valorem.

Strike out in lines 17, 18, and 19, page 7, the following words:

Motor vehicles, other than for railways and tramways, and automobiles and parts thereof, not including rubber tires, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Strike out from line 6, page 8, to line 2, page 9, inclusive, the following words:

Laths, 10 cents per 1,000 pieces.

Shingles, 30 cents per thousand.

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, planed or finished on one side, 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed or finished on one side and tongued and grooved, or planed or finished on two sides, 75 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed or finished on three sides, or planed and finished on two sides and tongued and grooved, \$1.12½ per 1,000 feet, board measure; planed and finished on four sides, \$1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure; and in estimating board measure under this schedule no deduction shall be made on board measure on account of planing, tonguing, and grooving.

Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 10 cents per ton: *Provided*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith.

Coal slack of culm of all kinds, such as will pass through a half-inch screen, 15 cents per ton.

Strike out in lines 1, 2, and 3, page 16, the following words:

Coal, bituminous, round and run of mine, including bituminous coal such as will not pass through a three-quarter-inch screen, 45 cents per ton.

On page 17, after line 13, insert the following:

Fresh meats: Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats, excepting game.

Bacon and hams not in tins or jars.

Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner.

Canned meats and canned poultry.

Extract of meat, fluid or not.

Lard and compounds thereof, cottonseed oil and cotton seed, and animal tallow.

Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen.

Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other airtight packages.

Wheat flour and semolina, and rye flour.

Oatmeal and rolled oats.

Corn meal.

Barley malt.

Barley, pot, pearled, or patent.

Buckwheat flour or meal.

Split peas, dried.

Prepared cereal foods of all kinds.

Bran middlings, and other offals of grain used for animal food.

Macaroni and vermicelli.

Biscuits, wafers, and cakes.

Biscuits, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, composed in whole or in part of eggs or any kind of flour or meal, when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruits, or confectionery; also candied peel, candied popcorn, candied nuts, candied fruits, sugar candy, and confectionery of all kinds.

Maple sugar and maple sirup.

Pickles, including pickled nuts, sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce.

Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juices and fruit sirup, nonalcoholic.

On page 19 strike out in lines 16 to 19, inclusive, the following words:

Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves.

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

And insert:

Logs; timber, however sided or squared; round timber, for whatever use; sawed boards; planks; deals, and other lumber, planed or unplanned, finished or unfinished; laths and shingles.

On page 20, line 1, after the word "kinds," strike out "not further manufactured than listed or jointed"; so as to make the paragraph read:

Wooden staves of all kinds, and stave bolts.

On page 20, after line 20, insert the following:

Aluminum in crude form; aluminum in plates, sheets, bars, and rods; iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites; scrap iron and scrap steel; iron in pigs; iron kentledge; spiegelisen and ferromanganese; all the articles, commodities, and forms of iron or steel described in paragraphs 119 to 173, inclusive, in the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909.

Strike out on page 21, lines 7 to 13, inclusive, the following words:

Rolled iron or steel sheets, or plates, No. 14 gauge or thinner, galvanized or coated with zinc, tin, or other metal, or not.

Crucible cast steel wire, valued at not less than 6 cents per pound.

Galvanized iron or steel wire, curved or not, Nos. 9, 12, and 13 wire gauge.

On page 21, after line 20, insert:

Coal of all kinds, screened or unscreened; agricultural implements of all kinds, including portable engines with boilers in combination, and horsepower or traction engines for farm purposes.

Automobiles, and parts thereof, including rubber tires; motor vehicles of all kinds, and parts thereof, and rubber tires therefor; crude rubber; manufactured rubber, which shall include all articles of which rubber is the component part of chief value.

Asbestos, further manufactured than ground; manufactures of asbestos or articles of which asbestos is the component material of chief value, including woven fabrics, wholly or in chief value of asbestos.

Printing ink, 17½ per cent ad valorem.

Cutlery, plated or not—pocketknives, penknives, scissors and shears, knives and forks for household purposes, and table steels.

Bells and gongs, brass corners, and rules for printers.

Basins, urinals, and other plumbing fixtures for bathrooms and lavatories; bathtubs, sinks, and laundry tubs of earthenware, stone, cement, or clay, or of other material.

Brass band instruments.

Clocks, watches, time recorders, clock and watch keys, clock cases, and clock movements.

Printers' wooden cases and cabinets for holding type.

Wood flour.

Leather and all manufactures thereof, including all manufactures of which leather is a component part.

Woolen yarns, cloth, and fabrics of all kinds, and the manufactures thereof, including all manufactures of which wool is a component part.

Cotton cloth, threads and fabrics of all kinds, and the manufactures thereof, including all manufactures of which cotton is a component part.

Silk cloth, threads and fabrics of all kinds, and the manufactures thereof, including all manufactures of which silk is a component part.

On page 23 strike out the proviso, beginning in line 10, as follows:

*Provided*, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence and shall make proclamation that the following articles, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila) are admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty, namely:

And insert:

*Provided*, That the articles above enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, shall be exempt from duty when the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence, and shall make proclamation:

First. That the following articles immediately hereinafter enumerated, the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, or any of its possessions, except the Philippine Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila, are and each thereof is admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty.

Second. That no export duty, export license fee, or other export charge of any kind whatsoever, whether in the form of additional charge or license fee, or otherwise, or any prohibition or restriction in any way of the exportation, whether by law, order, regulation, contractual relation, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, are being imposed upon the articles, or any of them, hereinbefore enumerated to be exempt from duty when imported into the United States; and

*Provided further*, That if at any time after said proclamation shall be issued the President of the United States shall have satisfactory evidence that the facts upon which the original proclamation was issued no longer exist, he shall then make proclamation to that effect, and the articles hereinbefore specified to be admitted to the United States exempt from duty shall be subject to such duties as the general tariff law of the United States shall then prescribe for such articles.

*Provided further*, That if at time after the articles hereinbefore mentioned are admitted free under the aforesaid proclamation the President becomes satisfied that the rates of transportation upon any such article from Canada into the United States are unreasonably low, as compared with fair and reasonable rates upon the like article for substantially the same distance in the United States, he may issue his proclamation to that effect, and thereafter the said article or articles, when imported from Canada into the United States, shall be subject to the general tariff law of the United States.

The articles to be admitted into the Dominion of Canada free of duty are as follows, to wit:

On page 27, after line 6, insert:

Logs; timber, however sided or squared; round timber, for whatever use; sawed boards; planks; deals, and other lumber, planed or unplanned, finished or unfinished; laths and shingles.

Strike out on page 27, lines 2 to 6, inclusive, the following words:

Timber, hewn, sided or squared otherwise than by sawing, and round timber used for spars or in building wharves.

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber, not further manufactured than sawed.

On page 27, line 13, after the word "kinds," strike out "not further manufactured than listed or jointed," so as to make the paragraph read:

Wooden staves of all kinds, and stave bolts.

On page 28, after line 20, insert:

Coal of all kinds, screened or unscreened; iron ore, including magnetiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I understand perfectly that this is not an inspiring atmosphere in which to speak. There are a certain number of Senators who seem to sit in silent, if not sullen, submission to a higher power, who are not interested in the discussion of this subject. There are a certain number of Senators who seem to me to be peering through the mists of the future in order to satisfy themselves with respect to the opinion which the people of the country will hold next year of the

drama that is now in progress in the Senate of the United States, and they are not deeply interested in the discussion of the matters which arise upon this bill. To me, therefore, it has become rather a duty than a pleasure to debate the questions with which we are confronted.

In order, Mr. President, that I may establish a beginning, I send to the Secretary's desk and ask that there shall be read the extracts that are attached to the paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[Washington Star, June 24, 1911.]

WILL VETO AMENDMENTS—PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES DETERMINATION TO PREVENT CHANGE IN RECIPROCITY TREATY.

In a long-distance telephone conversation with Senators to-day President Taft repeated his determination to veto the Canadian reciprocity bill in case any amendment is added.

Senators accept the President's ultimatum as applicable to modifications which might be made at the instance of Republicans as well as Democrats, and say that it would have the effect of preventing any agreement on amendments for tariff changes which might be acceptable to both insurgents and regular Republicans.

POINT RAISED BY FARMERS.

Many Senators have received telegrams and letters announcing a purpose on the part of the farmers to test the constitutionality of the proposed reciprocity law if it receives less than a two-thirds majority in the Senate. This position is taken on the ground that as the bill carries into effect the provisions of a treaty it should receive the vote in the Senate necessary to render a treaty effective.

The friends of the measure do not concede the point, but they are claiming the two-thirds.

[Washington Times, June 24, 1911.]

SENATE MINORITY LEADERS TO PLAN COURSE ON TARIFF—STONE SAYS HIS PARTY WILL FIGHT FOR UNAMENDED RECIPROCITY.

Senate Democratic leaders said to-day they expected an early conference of Democratic Senators to devise a program on reciprocity and tariff. They said the time had not been fixed, but that this would be the practicable way to arrive at an understanding. That the outcome will be decision to pass the reciprocity agreement without change is practically certain.

Senator STONE, of Missouri, who will lead the Democratic fight for reciprocity, was even more emphatic than ever to-day in declaring the agreement must not be amended.

MUST GO AS IT IS.

"It must be passed without the crossing of a 't' or the dotting of an 'i,'" said Senator STONE. "Most of our side feel that way about it. After that is done we can turn our attention to other tariff matters."

He added that what was done in way of revision depended on whether the insurgent Republicans would cooperate.

Asked about the length of the session, he said adjournment appeared about like an object looked at from the big end of a spyglass, extremely remote.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not know whether the statements contained in these extracts from two reputable newspapers are true or false. I do know, however, that they find great corroboration in everything that is said and in everything that is printed concerning the work in which we are now engaged. It must be conceded that a minority of the Republican Senators, most of whom have hitherto advocated the high and, in many instances, the indefensible duties of the present and former tariff laws upon manufactures, and a large majority of the Democratic Senators who have hitherto professed the doctrine of a tariff for revenue only, have united and intend to pass this bill, the chief characteristics of which are: First, to admit free of duty from Canada into the United States all the products of the farm and of the farmer; and, second, to admit free a small quantity of pulp wood, wood pulp, and print paper.

It is said—and it is said so often that I, at least, feel compelled to accept the statement as expressive of the situation—that these Senators, constituting a majority of the Senate, have determined to submit to the demand, so frequently repeated, that, without regard to fairness or justice, no change whatsoever shall be made in the terms of the measure, and that it must be passed in the precise form prescribed by the President of the United States. I make no comment upon the spectacle thus presented to the American people; I make no comment upon what seems to me to be an abdication of the duties of the Senate and an abandonment of its responsibilities. I earnestly hope—hope from the bottom of my heart—that these statements or rumors will prove to be a libel upon the Senate and upon the Chief Executive as well. Time alone will tell.

It is also stated in the extracts read and in many others that I might have collected and laid before the Senate that after the so-called or alleged reciprocity measure has been safely passed, Democratic Senators will bring forward certain bills to remove and reduce duties. Their former allies will now, of course, desert them, for however willing they may be to send the farmer into free competition, they will be found valiant enough in the defense of high duties for the rich and powerful manufacturers.

Then, it is said that these Democratic Senators expect that another group of Republican Senators, who for two years now and more have stood consistently and faithfully and earnestly



for a reduction of the onerous and excessive duties in the present law and in the law which preceded it, will join them to adopt in some form or other a revision of certain schedules, believing and, as many of the newspapers of the country are insisting, hoping that the President will veto these bills, and that thus the issue for the campaign of 1912 will be prepared.

I am not commissioned to defend the Democratic Senators against this aspersion upon their fidelity to the public interest, but I shall not believe, until I am compelled to believe through the result of a roll call, that the program that is thus insisted upon elsewhere and throughout the country is to be the program of a majority of the Senators of this body. I shall cherish my confidence in the integrity of purpose of all the Senators in this body until it shall be destroyed, not by rumors, not by the speculations of newspaper writers, but by the record itself; and I earnestly hope that this session may draw to a close with that confidence full, complete, and unshaken.

I have, therefore, brought forward this morning a series of amendments to the pending measure for which I ask your calm and patriotic consideration. I am not presenting these amendments in order to defeat the measure as it came from the House of Representatives and as it is insisted upon by the President of the United States; I do not speak for any of my associates who are commonly called progressives; I make no pledge or promise for them; but as for myself, I say that if these amendments or the substance of them receive the approval of the Senate I shall vote for the reciprocal measure about which so much discussion has been had. I do not present these amendments to destroy the measure; I present them to correct the measure, to remove from it the obvious and evident injustice that there is in it. I present them in the hope that by and through their adoption by the Senate of the United States the people of this country can be made to believe that it is the purpose of Congress to deal fairly with all the people of the country and not to select one class for a discrimination so invidious and so harmful that their confidence in our Government must be shattered if the bill as it is receives the approval of Congress and the approval of the President.

I asked in the beginning, as you observed, that the reading of the amendments might be dispensed with, because I wanted to lay them before you from my own standpoint and in my own way. I intend to take them up somewhat in detail a little later, but just now I want to say of them and for them that they do not touch the general tariff of the country. They relate only to our tariff with Canada, and they are fairly and properly a part of any new relation that we desire to establish with that country.

Further than that they do not ask, save in two respects, any additional concession from Canada. As I said the other day, I believe that, in view of her policy, her future, the promise of her development and growth, Canada has in the arrangement which is now before us conceded everything to the United States that she can concede and maintain her industries and perpetuate her prosperity. I do not ask more from Canada. I ask simply that in graduating our concessions to her we shall be mindful of the market in which the farmer must buy as well as the market in which the farmer must sell.

Later I will make more detailed observations upon the amendments, but just now I want Senators to remember, as I proceed, that the only additional concessions which my amendments propose on the part of Canada are all kinds of logs and timber and all kinds of coal. If Canada will admit into her territory all our timber and lumber of whatever kind and all our coal of whatever kind, I for one am content with the concessions which she seems to be willing to grant to us. But these amendments, when they come to deal with the considerations which we grant to Canada, change the whole aspect of the bargain or trade. That you may be able to perceive the purport of the amendments as I proceed with my discussion, allow me to say that I take from the reciprocal dutiable list, so far as the United States is concerned, a list of articles which represent the manufactured products of agriculture as distinguished from the raw products of agriculture. Remember, now all the while, that I am not insisting that Canada shall grant us a like extension of her free list, because she can not do so in justice to herself, but in justice to the American people, in justice to the American consumer, in justice to the American farmer we can not grant the free admission of raw agricultural products from Canada into the United States without at the same time granting to her the free admission of manufactured agricultural products as well. Therefore, after striking from our reciprocal dutiable list these articles, I add them to our free list, namely:

Fresh meats—Beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, and all other fresh or refrigerated meats, excepting game.  
Bacon and hams not in tins or jars.

Meats of all kinds, dried, smoked, salted, in brine, or prepared or preserved in any manner.

Canned meats and canned poultry.

Extract of meat, fluid or not.

Lard and compounds thereof, cottolene and cotton stearin, and animal stearin.

Tallow.

Egg yolk, egg albumen, and blood albumen.

Tomatoes and other vegetables, including corn, in cans or other airtight packages.

Wheat flour and semolina, and rye flour.

Oatmeal and rolled oats.

Corn meal.

Barley malt.

Barley, pot, pearled, or patent.

Buckwheat flour or meal.

Split peas, dried.

Prepared cereal foods of all kinds.

Bran middlings, and other offals of grain used for animal food.

Macaroni and vermicelli.

Biscuits, wafers, and cakes.

Biscuits, wafers, cakes, and other baked articles, composed in whole or in part of eggs or any kind of flour or meal, when combined with chocolate, nuts, fruits, or confectionery; also candied peel, candied popcorn, candied nuts, candied fruits, sugar candy, and confectionery of all kinds.

Maple sugar and maple sirup.

Pickles, including pickled nuts, sauces of all kinds, and fish paste or sauce.

Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juices and fruit sirup, nonalcoholic.

Do you believe, may I ask in passing, that this will render the arrangement less satisfactory to Canada? Do you not know that Canada will look upon the proposal with vastly more favor, if you are desiring the arrangement, with these things added to our free list than she will if they bear reciprocal duties? But that is not all. I add also free lumber of all kinds, and I phrase it in this way:

Logs; timber, however sided or squared; round timber, for whatever use; sawed boards; planks; deals, and other lumber, planed or unplanned, finished or unfinished; laths and shingles.

And so on through the list of lumber, whether raw, partly manufactured, or wholly manufactured. All that I ask is, when you take away from the American farmer the benefits that he has heretofore enjoyed under the protective tariff and the larger benefits and advantages that he is about to enjoy, that you give him at least the opportunity of buying his lumber, whether planed or unplanned, from Canada without imposing upon it any duty whatsoever.

I add also all forms of iron and steel, beginning with iron ore. I am perfectly aware that Canada at this time can not be expected to be a serious competitor with the United States in the production of iron and steel, but we are doing something to build up Canada; we are doing something here to invigorate her industries and carry her forward at a still more rapid pace into the development which she fondly expects and may reasonably hope for. I want, when that time comes, if these industries can be planted, and I believe they will be planted, in Canada, and thus become competitors of our industries of like character, I want the benefit for the American consumer, and especially the American farmer, in the reduced prices which will result from competition of that kind. Do you think Canada will object to the introduction of these articles upon her free list? On the contrary, she will look upon the arrangement with just so much more satisfaction.

I have also included woolen goods and fabrics of all kinds, cotton goods and fabrics of all kinds, silk goods and fabrics of all kinds, leather goods in all their forms, so that in the time to come, if not now, we may reasonably hope for competition in Canada respecting these things that will be as active and as beneficial as it is now said that competition in agricultural products will be.

I can not understand that state of mind which can contemplate the subjection of the farmer to free competition on the hypothesis that the conditions in Canada are substantially the conditions here, that will shrink from free competition in manufactured products as well.

I appeal especially to my friends upon the other side of the Chamber, for I have no hope of my associates on this side of the Chamber; they will help you to remove the duties from agricultural products, but they will not help you to lower the duties by a farthing upon the great manufactured products of the country.

I will be met at once—and I did not intend to enter upon the discussion of the details of these amendments so fully at the present time, but I must be permitted to refer to this phase now—I will be met at once with the thought, if it is not expressed, that we ought not to give these things to Canada for nothing; that we ought to exact something, some concession, from Canada because we extend our free list to that country. That thought has no weight with me. Canada can not give us these things and preserve her own industrial system. But I want to remind Senators that the agitation which began 10



years ago in the ranks of the Republican Party and has continued unabated from that time until the present moment concerned the reduction of our duties for the benefit of our own people—the reduction of our own duties in order that those who consume the things we produce may buy them in the markets of the country at a fair and reasonable price, and the more we give away of unnecessary duties the richer we will be. We ought not to ask any direct equivalent for these concessions to Canada.

I have asked the Senate to adopt the amendments because the very basis of the whole measure that we have before us, as declared over and over again by the President of the United States and by all those who have advocated it, is that the conditions of life and of industry and of manufacture in Canada are substantially similar to our own.

If that is true, we do not need to reduce our duties in dealing with Canada. We need to remove our duties entirely when dealing with Canada, because it was to equalize such conditions as I have named that the advocates and defenders of the protective system—and I am as profoundly impressed and convinced as I ever was before of its justice and its beneficence—established the protective system, and when there are no conditions to equalize, when industry flows upon an even and a level surface we do not require these duties in order to protect our manufacturers.

I should like to hear some one in the Senate before this debate shall have closed give some reason why we should not extend free meat to Canada and free flour and free iron and steel and free boots and shoes—free everything that we think will benefit our own people—and we are proceeding upon the hypothesis, those of us who want to lower duties, that we are rendering a service to our own citizens when we reduce duties, and it would be the height of inconsistency to require that before we yield these duties we must receive from a foreign nation some equivalent for the concessions.

Ah, if you will but look at these amendments from the standpoint which I occupy, if you will but examine them in the spirit which animates me, you will see in the amendments not an obstacle to the establishment of these new relations with Canada, but a new force that will lead the movement to still completer victories. I can not understand why any Senator here who is in favor of the reduction of duties should hesitate for a single moment in approving the amendments I have offered.

Now, the difficulty as I have understood it, and I am speaking mainly to my Democratic friends, because it is upon them that we mainly rely in adopting any amendment to this measure, is one of Executive approval, but it can not be said, and nobody has ever said with any authority, that the President of the United States will veto this bill because we add to the free list with Canada.

All these statements, which are so rife and which seem to have taken possession of so many minds, have been made with regard to amendments which are either entirely dissociated from the arrangement and constitute a general revision of the tariff, or amendments which will make it less probable that the Canadian Government will accept the bill as it passes the Senate or as it passes Congress.

You can not say that with regard to these amendments. You are at one stroke making the measure just, and you are making it more satisfactory to the Canadian Government, and therefore, I assume, inasmuch as the President of the United States wants the enterprise to succeed, more satisfactory to those who have promoted this departure from our general tariff plan.

I would not have it understood, Senators, that if I had been arranging such a matter as this I would have taken up the subject in the way in which it has been taken up. I am a protectionist. I believe that there are some differences in agriculture between Canada and the United States which entitle our farmers to some duty on some things if we are to preserve with integrity our party belief. I do not want it to be understood that I would willingly depart from that doctrine, but I have no control over the existing situation.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator from Iowa pardon me if I make an inquiry?

Mr. CUMMINS. With pleasure.

Mr. BACON. I desire to do so before the Senator gets too far away from something which he said a few moments ago in regard to the question whether or not the President of the United States would veto a measure. We have had a great deal of talk of that kind in the Senate. The question I desire to ask the Senator is whether he thinks it is a proper thing that legislation should be attempted to be influenced in the Senate by a statement that the President will or that the President will not veto a measure? Does not the Senator think that it is not only the province, but the duty of the legislative department of

the Government to proceed in the enactment of measures according to the judgment of the several Houses and without reference to the question what the Executive may think or the Executive may do—at least so far as that reference may be used for the purpose of influencing the acts of the legislative branch of the Government?

Mr. CUMMINS. I answer that inquiry with more gratification than I ever replied to any question put to me upon the floor of the Senate. It is abhorrent to me to hear it suggested that any Senator will be influenced by the probable action of the Executive upon a measure under consideration.

I think it is the beginning of the end of the dignity and the power and the respectability of the House and of the Senate to hear it reiterated day after day that we must not amend a measure because it will meet with the disapproval of the Executive in its amended form. I wish that some one of more experience than I have had in this Chamber and whose words would therefore be weightier and more potential than mine can be would stand here and warn the country of the consequences that must ensue from the attempt to influence legislation through the suggestion that it will or will not meet the approval of the President. I have only referred to this phase of the subject because I have heard day after day Senators rise and say that we can not amend this measure because if we do the President will veto it, and thus we will lose whatever benefit or advantage there may be in it.

The Senator from Georgia has heard these declarations, and I am sure that they have been just as repugnant to him as they have been to me. I wish that the Senate of the United States could once more reassert its immunity from influences of the character that have been suggested.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say, in order that I may not be misunderstood, that of course I recognize the fact that within certain limitations it is contemplated by the Constitution that the President shall communicate to Congress what his views are. Therefore I do not wish to go to the extreme of saying that no consideration is to be paid to the views of the Executive, because I recognize that there is a contemplation in the Constitution in the provision which requires the President to give information to the legislative branch of the Government—a contemplation that there shall be some regard paid to the views thus expressed.

But the particular point that I had in mind and which the Senator from Iowa has more fully expressed is as to the propriety of attempting to influence the action of either branch of Congress by the threat on the floor that if such and such a thing is done, not that it will not meet with the approval—that might be subject to a different construction—but that it will meet with the veto of the President. That, I think, is an improper thing to state on the floor of the Senate, and I took advantage of the opportunity to express my view on it. It is not original with me by any means. I can recollect some very eminent Senators with whom I had the honor to serve when I first came to the Senate expressing themselves in very strong language condemnatory of such a suggestion. It is the high prerogative and function of the legislative branch of the Government to legislate without the suggestion of such arguments for the purpose of influencing their action.

Mr. CUMMINS. I so heartily agree with the Senator from Georgia that I would like to emphasize his view of it in every way I can. I think I recognize the field of propriety in that respect as well as the field of impropriety. The bill is before the Senate, and a Senator considering whether he should vote for it or seek to modify it has quite the right to look at the general views of the Executive and to form a judgment with respect to the fate that it may meet when it reaches him for approval. That is quite right and quite proper. But we have been assaulted here day after day by the newspapers—possibly some of them have not been guilty of it—iterating and reiterating, apparently with authority, that if this bill is amended in any fashion whatsoever, no matter how meritorious the amendment may be, it will be vetoed by the President, and that influence has been poured into this Chamber until it seems to fill the minds of many Senators, and they do not feel at liberty to exercise that judgment and that conscience which they otherwise would.

I am not saying that the President of the United States is responsible for these statements. I know that they are so uniform and so universal that they have at last found lodgment in the Senate, and I repeat I have only referred to this phase of it because I have heard day after day distinguished Senators,



especially on the other side of the Chamber, and some on this side of the Chamber, say that although we may make other bills the subject of consideration after this bill has passed, we must not add anything to it, because when it reaches the President it will be disapproved by him.

I repeat that the amendments which I have proposed are in harmony with the arrangement, will speed its progress to a final conclusion, and can not impair the chances of its finally receiving the Executive approval.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BACON. I desire to say that at present the inclination of my mind is to the method of voting for the reciprocity measure without amendment, but it is not for the reason suggested by the Senator. I would not be influenced in any measure by the suggestions which have been made and which have been repeated by the Senator—that if amended it would meet with an Executive veto. I could not myself be influenced by a consideration of that kind.

But I want to suggest to the learned Senator that it is a poor rule which does not work both ways. I very much favor in the main—I will not say in detail—the reductions which are suggested by him. The only difference between the Senator and myself is as to the method to be pursued in order to effect those reductions. The present inclination of my mind is to pursue them in separate bills.

I understand the Senator to have himself said on the floor of the Senate—I am not sure that I quote him correctly; if I do not he will correct me—but my recollection is that the Senator has himself urged as a reason why the reduction measures should not be adopted separately from the reciprocity measure is that those measures when thus separately enacted would receive an Executive veto. I myself am proposing to proceed to the passage of the reciprocity measure by itself, without reference to the question whether or not the President would veto it; and then I think the consistent course is to pursue the enactment of the reduction measures separately without having the fear of an Executive veto to deter us from so doing.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I believe I have repeated heretofore the suggestion, and the Senator from Georgia will remember that I did it in response to a statement from some Senator—I will not name him, nor am I sure that I could name him—that if these bills were presented independently, and if presented in that way they would not be approved by the President, then it was manifest we ought, in order to do justice, to attach them to the reciprocity bill.

But the Senator from Georgia and all Senators who are listening to me must remember that I am now presenting amendments which relate only to Canada. They are not made and could not be made the subject of general bills. Of course, there could be reductions to all countries in our general tariff in an independent bill, but these amendments relate simply to further reductions in duties to the Dominion of Canada. No Senator can deceive himself, I am sure, with the thought that if he does not attach them to the present measure he can make them the subject of an independent measure, because he can not.

There are a great many things in these amendments, I fancy, no Senator would be willing to put on the free list so far as the world at large is concerned, and they are put upon the free list so far as Canada is concerned simply because we are dealing with that nation as though it were substantially like our own, with conditions not very different from our own.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and to whom?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming, who rose first.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wish to ask the Senator if, in his judgment, any of his amendments are obnoxious to the parliamentary rule and the rule of the Senate that all amendments must be germane to the subject matter of the bill. I think there may be a possible clearing in the minds of some who desire to vote for some of these amendments, but fear that they may be obnoxious to that parliamentary rule. For myself I do not ask for information, but only to get the views of the Senator in the RECORD.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to give the Senator from Wyoming my view on that subject. In the first place, there is no parliamentary rule and no rule of the Senate which requires an amendment to be germane to the subject of the bill to which it is offered as an amendment. Our rules provide that with

reference to appropriation bills the amendments must be germane, and there are other provisions also with regard to amendments to appropriation bills, but there is no rule of the Senate and no general parliamentary rule which requires an amendment to be germane to a bill. If, however, we were under such a rule, every amendment which I have offered is germane to the subject matter of the bill. In my opinion, when the farmers' products are put on the free list, any amendment which relates to the market in which he must buy is germane to such a bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Iowa is, I think, absolutely correct in suggesting that there is no rule requiring that amendments shall be germane to ordinary legislative bills. I think the records of the Senate will show that on one occasion a land law of great consequence and of great length was offered as an amendment to a private pension bill and it became a part of that bill. Our custom, I think, has been never to raise a question except on appropriation bills as to whether or not an amendment is germane. I may be wrong about the rule, and I would be glad if the Senator from Wyoming would quote the rule, if there is such a rule, because I have forgotten it if it exists.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I did not assume, as a matter of absolute fact, that there was such a rule. I could not assume that because it has frequently occurred that amendments were made which were not in harmony with the general purpose of the bill; but I know that objections of that sort have been raised in regard to the very amendments which are proposed by the Senator from Iowa, and I wanted the views of that Senator in the RECORD so as to show that that view is absolutely not tenable, not for the purpose of raising any discussion as to the parliamentary rule.

Mr. CUMMINS. There seems to be a general concurrence in regard to that.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], who rose a few moments ago, if some one will call his attention to the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa yields to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa to discuss the effect of his amendment under the favored-nation clause. I should like to hear a discussion of that phase of his amendment, as I understand he proposes to admit these articles free of duty from Canada. I have offered a similar amendment, limited in its scope. It has since occurred to me that under the favored-nation clause the same advantages will have to be extended to every country in the world. I think if we do that we are skating on thin ice. I should like to hear the Senator's views on that particular phase of his amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Before I have concluded what I have to say upon my amendments I intend to discuss, with some care, the history and the interpretation of the favored-nation clause. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me to defer an answer to his question until I reach it in the orderly course of my argument.

Mr. GORE. I, of course, would prefer that the Senator should do that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will only say now, in order not to leave any false or misleading impression in the mind of any Senator, that in my opinion the bill as I propose to amend it is much less likely to collide with the favored-nation clause than the bill as it is presented to the Senate by the House of Representatives and by the President.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Canada being largely an agricultural country, the bill as now proposed would, in agricultural products, conclude a reciprocity agreement with the United States. If that agreement should work a hardship to the farmer because of the fact that Canada is so largely agricultural and is limited in her manufactured articles, the remedy proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Iowa would meet the contention that injury is done the farmer, that his wheat is put in competition with Canadian wheat and his rye and barley and his animal products. But when it comes to manufactured products, if a like reciprocal arrangement were made with Canada, would the farmer receive the same remedy



to compensate for the evil done? Would there not of necessity be a call for a larger free-trade arrangement with other countries to offset what he might suffer? I see that the so-called farmers' free-list bill has no relation whatever to Canada.

Just one question further. I am asking for information, and I hope the Senator from Iowa will devote a few moments to this point. Was it not, perhaps, for that reason that the President of the United States did not propose that Canada should give all these articles in the limited measure in which she manufactures free to the United States? Was it not for the very reason that when he opened that question he would lay himself liable largely to other countries which do manufacture extensively, but which do not produce extensively?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, one part of the question I exclude at once, for I would not venture upon an answer to it, namely, I do not know what actuated the President. I do not know what his views are upon the subject suggested. I can only answer for my own. It is quite true, as suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, that the amendments which I have proposed enlarging our free list, so far as Canada is concerned, will not constitute full and adequate compensation to the farmer for putting him in free competition with the Canadian farmer; and I do not want it to be understood for a moment that I think these amendments are the only ones that should be added or made to this bill.

I agree that in order to restore the equilibrium we must reduce duties with other countries, and I agree that we must put a great many things upon the free list with the world in order to give the farmer a fair market in which to buy. We are far, however, from accomplishing that purpose, and this step in the right direction in no wise interferes with the next one that ought to be taken.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me just one other suggestion—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. In all fairness to this side, the Senator has come exactly to the position I have and that this side have maintained in regard to reciprocity, namely, that this step toward the admission of Canadian products in return for American products is a step in the right direction, and that it does not go far enough. Yet we are perfectly willing to take it as far as it goes, and I am glad to see that the Senator from Iowa, in reference to manufactured products, has taken exactly the same position.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, now, I can not wholly concur with the Senator from South Carolina. I do not believe that this is a step in the right direction. I believe that unless it is accompanied with whatever relief practically free trade with Canada can give the farmer it is a step in the wrong direction. I agree that if we can put the American farmer upon the same plane or basis with the Canadian farmers with respect to what he buys, as well as with regard to what he sells, we have taken a step in the right direction; but whenever you stop short and this year put the farmer in free competition with his chief rival and then delay to some far-distant, vague time the compensation that you would give him, when you at least could give him all the benefits that free trade with Canada in manufactured products will give him, you are doing him, as I think, a grave injustice, and you are not stepping in the right direction. I expect to join whoever shall be in favor of reducing duties generally. I expect to be in favor of putting upon the free list very many things that are not now there. I have voted so before; I shall vote so again.

But why will not the Senator from South Carolina join me in putting on the free list, so far as the United States is concerned, meat as well as cattle, and flour as well as wheat?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I would answer, Mr. President, by saying that I am heartily in accord with the idea of incorporating into our law the proposition known as the free-list bill and allowing it to take such scope as will compensate the farmer in the largest possible sense for the injury done him. I think that answers that question.

I want to ask the Senator from Iowa another question, and I do it because of his frankness and his disposition to go to the bottom of every phase of this question. I am not saying this in any facetious mood; I am in earnest. I take great pleasure in listening to his arguments. But there was one point he made a moment ago, and it was made by a Senator yesterday, that now that the production of grain has about reached the point where consumption and production are about equal, when for the first time in the history of the American farmer he is coming to the point where the protective doctrine can be of benefit to him, it seems to me the irresistible logic of that position is

that here is an industry of the United States exploited to its fullest extent in view of the area necessary for other American agricultural products; that now the American people, having to eat bread, must be forced by legislative enactment to depend upon the American farmer; and as the population exceeds production and the necessity for living becomes sharper, the American farmer comes into his own in that the circumstances of the case put him in a position where he can mulct every American bread eater and make him pay him a premium because of this law. I want to say, Mr. President, in this connection, that as a farmer I do not subscribe to that, and in so far as I produce grain, I am perfectly willing to take my chances with the Creator who opened up the fields for the benefit of those people for the necessities of life. I do not think it is good statesmanship or good politics to say that, because a geographical line divides us from Canada and the American wheat fields have reached their limit of supplying the American people, therefore the American wheat consumer, by virtue of a system which the Republican Party has inaugurated, must be made to pay a premium to the American farmer.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I differentiate very sharply between what will probably happen and what ought to happen, but I think it is probably true that there is something that clusters around the foodstuffs of a country which precludes raising their price materially by means of a tariff. But I differ entirely with the Senator from South Carolina when he says we have reached the limit of production of foodstuffs.

Mr. President, if the profit in agriculture were sufficient, the United States has a soil which, because of its fertility as well as its extent, could raise foodstuffs not only for our 90,000,000, but for our 90,000,000 multiplied five times and more. It is only a question of profit in the business.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. Wait just a moment. Now, mark, if we are to preserve—and I am now speaking to my fellow Senators on this side—if we are to preserve the wages which are supposed to be lifted up through the medium of the protective tariff, if we are to preserve the profits in manufactures that are supposed to be made possible by the protective tariff, then the farmers' products are just as much entitled to be lifted up and held up through the protective tariff as are the wages of our workmen and the profits of our manufacturers.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The Senator's argument from the standpoint of equity, if we are to have a protective system, is all right, but I want to ask the Senator this question: If through the operation of protection for the grain growers or the agricultural producers, they are given such profit as is suggested by inference from the Senator's remarks as to encourage the back-to-the-farm movement, which has been a cry of late years, and this increase of the fields reaches the 9 times 90, you will then have such an export surplus that you will immediately reduce the farmer to conditions that have just antedated those that you are now congratulating him upon having arrived at. Therefore, under this argument, the inference seems irresistible that you must grant the farmer just such profit as will enable him merely to furnish the American people with just enough bread at just a profit, and then preclude him from making any more, because so surely as he makes a surplus through the profitableness of his occupation and that surplus is thrown upon the markets of the world in competition with other countries that have not our system of protection, the price in America will inevitably sink to the price of that surplus.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter upon any discussion of the protective system. I—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CUMMINS. Allow me just a moment. I know that my friend from South Carolina finds no defense for it; I am a believer in it, but just at this time I see the farmer passing out of it. There is nothing that can be done in this Chamber or elsewhere to keep him in it.

Now, if it were imminent, if it were a question that were about to be debated or decided by impartial minds, I would be glad to enter upon a general review of that subject; but I know that the day has come in which the farmer is to be excluded from the benefits and advantages of the protective tariff. The decree has already been written. It only needs the formal approval—I will not say forever, but for the time being—to exclude him from the company of the manufacturers of the United States.



I shall not exhaust my strength in endeavoring to resist the movement which has received such an impetus here, not only upon your side of the Chamber but upon ours as well. The only thing that I am trying to do is to make sure that as the farmer passes out from the consideration of the American Congress, at the moment that he is denied the privileges which he has heretofore enjoyed, at the moment that he is subjected in his products to free competition with the world practically, he shall at least receive whatever advantage there is in buying freely from Canada all her manufactured products. That is my whole case, and there is no answer to it; there will be no answer attempted to it. I will venture to say that no man will rise in this Chamber and deny either its justice or its fairness. I shall make that record for and in behalf of the American farmer, and I will leave him in the future to determine who stood in the way of the slight benefit or compensation that might ensue to him if he had free trade with Canada in manufactured products as well.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, we hear so little from those who are supporting this pact that when Senators, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has done, come into the discussion, I feel as though we are justified in trying to find out, if it can be done, what their attitude is with reference to this particular bill. Now, if the Senator from Iowa will permit me, the Senator from South Carolina seemed to base his support of this bill upon the ground that food products under present conditions are being taxed and that this bill is removing that tax. I should like to know where the features are in this bill that remove any present tax upon a food product to the consumer. For instance, here is wheat put on the free list; will you get any cheaper bread? Here is barley put on the free list; will you get any cheaper beer? Here is rye put on the free list; will you get any cheaper whisky? Here is oats put on the free list; will you get any cheaper oatmeal or any cheaper breakfast food? No. Here is cattle put on the free list; will you get any cheaper meat? No. The tariff remains higher than before bread and upon flour, and, as the Senator from Texas showed clearly the other day, the tariff remains higher than before upon meat.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Now, will the Senator from South Dakota allow me?

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am holding the floor simply until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] gets a drink of water. I think he is about to return, but I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina if he will simply indicate where the other side finds any relief to the consumer.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS entered the Chamber.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield the floor to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. This is a very important and interesting discussion, and I think we ought to have more Senators in attendance. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bacon	Cummins	Kenyon	Pomerene
Borah	Curtis	Lippitt	Shively
Bourne	Dillingham	McCumber	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Dixon	McLean	Smoot
Briggs	du Pont	Martin, Va.	Stone
Brown	Gallinger	Myers	Swanson
Bryan	Gore	Nelson	Thornton
Burnham	Gronna	Oliver	Townsend
Burton	Heyburn	Overman	Watson
Chilton	Hitchcock	Page	Williams
Clark, Wyo.	Johnson, Me.	Penrose	Works
Crawford	Johnston, Ala.	Perkins	

Mr. THORNTON. My colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. FOSTER], has been called from the Chamber.

Mr. STONE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. REED] is unavoidably out of the city for a day or two. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I was in hopes that some member of the Finance Committee would be here. It is evident that there is no interest in this subject of reciprocity—not enough to keep a quorum here. Would it not be well to postpone this

matter until next November or December? I would call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who I believe is the next ranking member of the Committee on Finance—

Mr. GALLINGER. I did not hear the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. NELSON. It is evident—and I make that suggestion to the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot]—that it is difficult to keep a quorum in the Chamber to consider this matter, and in view of that fact would it not be a good plan to postpone the further consideration of this subject until next November or December?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a hesitancy in even expressing an opinion in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, who is my mentor to a certain extent in matters of legislation which come before that committee. I will say for myself that if I could have my way I would have a concurrent resolution passed through both Houses of Congress taking a recess until the first Monday in December next. That is what I would do, but I apprehend that is impossible, and I suppose we have got to have this tedious—and I have no reference—

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no doubt what I am saying is tedious.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no reference to the Senator from Iowa because he always talks entertainingly, but tedious for the reason that we find it difficult to get Senators to talk, and we amble along here discussing all sorts of things, and I do not see that we are making very much progress. If we are not to take a recess, which I would like to have taken, I personally am in favor of voting on these bills in the near future. I do not want to be kept here all summer engaged in mere conversation. I should like action of some kind or other.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that the difficulty in the case is this: There is scarcely anyone who is willing to say much of anything good on this reciprocity bill, and that is very embarrassing. They not only seem not disposed to say much in favor of it, but they are not disposed to listen to those who are saying something against it.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, I think this is the first instance in my somewhat protracted experience in this body when a bill, important as this is claimed to be, has come before the Senate without the proponents of the bill advocating it and leading the way, blazing the way, for the opponents of the bill to take their position in regard to it.

It is extraordinary, but I do not see how we can change that. It has pained me; I have tried to remain in my seat and have done so when I possibly could; but it has pained me to see so many empty seats when distinguished Senators, like the Senator from Minnesota, were making illuminating arguments against this bill. It was painful.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. In just a moment. It does not pain me at all to speak to empty seats. I know perfectly well that every Senator has made up his mind with respect to this matter. We are not considering it in the light of reason. That doctrine which has recently received such impetus and emphasis in another branch of this Government does not prevail here. There is no Senator who cares anything about the reason of it—and I am not disparaging Senators either—and therefore I do not want it to be understood that I complain in the least degree of the habit of Senators in leaving the Chamber. I know that it is impossible for the chairman of the Finance Committee to remain here. He is never here except at roll calls—I mean while this measure is under discussion—and for a very good reason. In his heart he is not for this bill. He feels compelled to vote for it for reasons which he has not yet given to the Senate and probably will not.

But I resume, leaving the Senators at entire liberty, so far as I am concerned, to go wheresoever their inclinations lead them.

Mr. STONE and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and to whom?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question, but I do not want his argument, which I concede is better phrased, but I can not agree is better bot-tomed than mine, interjected into the Record at just this place.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is not. But the Senator yielded to the Senator from South Dakota to ask me a question, and it is just for a moment to reply to that.

Mr. CUMMINS. But if the Senator from South Carolina will not take it ill, I hope he will reserve his reply to the Senator from South Dakota until some other time.



Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. The only reason—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa declines to yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will willingly yield to a question to me, but not for an argument on the subject.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is not for an argument. It almost amounts to a question of personal privilege. But if the Senator sees fit to allow him to incorporate what he says—

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina. He can speak as long as he pleases.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; I beg the Senator's pardon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa yields the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am much obliged to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have, I think with sufficient detail, explained to the Senate the character of the amendments which I have proposed to the bill. There are some Senators here, however, who have not heard the explanation, and I know they will do me the honor to read these amendments.

I now desire to say a few words with respect to the general subject, in order to make it perfectly clear what attitude I assume with regard to reciprocity with Canada.

Mr. President, the import duties which for many years we have levied and which we are now levying against Canada are indefensible from any point of view, moral or economic; and it is not strange that millions of our people, without either critical or comprehensive knowledge of the proposal contained in the bill now under consideration, give it their approval, simply because it removes some of the unnecessary burdens laid upon commerce between Canada and the United States.

I was one of the pioneers in the movement for freer trade relations between the two countries, and I am still so thoroughly convinced that reciprocal relations can be established which will be of lasting and mutual advantage that I profoundly regret my inability to give this measure, in its present form, my instant and cordial support. I would gladly vote for absolute free trade between the two nations, but I know that Canada could not endure, and therefore will not accept, free competition. I would cheerfully vote for a horizontal reduction of 50 per cent in our duties against the Dominion without asking any reduction whatever in Canadian duties against us, not only because it would be just, but because it would benefit the United States.

Our average duties upon dutiable articles brought in from Canada, put upon an ad valorem basis, have been for many years and now are about 43 per cent. Canada's average duties levied upon our imports into that country, reduced to the same basis, have been and are a little less than 25 per cent. Under this striking disparity of tariffs the 7,000,000 of people in Canada bought from us last year commodities of the value of \$239,000,000, whereas the 90,000,000 of people in the United States bought from Canada commodities of the value of \$113,000,000. It is not possible to emphasize the significance of these plain facts, and I repeat here, as I have so often said elsewhere, that it is our immediate and imperative duty to correct so flagrant a wrong committed, not alone against our own people, but the people of a neighboring and friendly nation as well.

In view of the opinions I have so long held and so frequently expressed, it is hard to believe that I will be driven to the alternatives of expressing my sympathy with the movement for freer trade with Canada by voting for the bill or of expressing my deep conviction of its inadequacy and its unfairness by voting against it. Of one thing, however, I am sure, namely, that it is my bounden duty as a citizen and as a Member of this body to expend all the strength I have in the effort to so amend the proposal that it will not only create better relations between the two countries, but will be just to the people of our own country.

In view of the insistence from many quarters, high and low, that the proposed arrangement as found in the bill ought to be immune from the ordinary processes of legislation and that it is our duty to either accept or reject it without amendment, I intend to inquire somewhat into the source of the alleged immunity, for the purpose of ascertaining, if it be possible, why we should abdicate the powers and duties which the Constitution confers and imposes upon us. Whatever opinions we may hold upon the arrangement submitted to us by the President, every Senator who is conscious of the least respect for the body of which he is a Member must regret the circumstances which have surrounded the measure on its way to the Senate and which seem to have fixed its standing here.

The Constitution bestows authority to legislate upon Congress and the authority to veto upon the President, but with reference to this bill the powers of these departments of government seem to be transposed; for if we yield to the demand so intolerantly made, it is the President who has exercised the powers of legislation and Congress the powers of approval or rejection. Upon a former occasion I entered my protest against the modern tendency toward the Executive usurpation of legislative functions, and I enter it again. It may be granted that sometimes through the single will of an Executive more and better things may be accomplished for the people than through the diversified wills of a discordant body of legislators; but if the experience of the world has proved any one thing in government, it is that the safety and permanence of free institutions depend upon the rigid observance of the lines which mark the separate provinces of legislative, executive, and judicial authority.

I heartily commend the President for his careful investigation of this subject, and receive with respect his recommendations, but I dissent wholly from the opinion apparently held by some of his advisers that the executive department could, without legislative authority, lawfully make a proposal to Canada or lawfully receive a proposal from Canada touching changes in the tariff law.

There are many people who believe, honestly no doubt, that we ought to approve or disapprove the arrangement just as it was agreed upon by the State Department, and that any attempt to amend it is but an indirect effort to accomplish its defeat. This belief implies that the measure is not before us as an ordinary revenue bill, originating in the House of Representatives, and under the Constitution as open to amendment here as a bill of any other character, but that it has some peculiar characteristic which exempts it from the usual course of legislation. I do not know nor do I care what power the representatives of Canada had in the matter, but I propose to examine, in the friendliest spirit, the authority of the executive department of our Government to do what it has done. In the abstract, I can but regard the course pursued as a dangerous intrusion upon the rights and privileges of the Congress of the United States. I would not dwell a single moment upon this phase of the subject were it not that, as a consequence of it, we are met in the Senate by two propositions, both of which are asserted in order to destroy the liberty of amendment which ordinarily we exercise according to our individual consciences and judgments, but of which we are, in this instance, sought to be deprived. These propositions are:

First. That the executive department has carried its negotiations and its agreements to that point which enables it to say that Canada will not give more for the concessions which we grant, nor take less for the concessions which she grants, nor consider other proposals.

Second. That, as viewed by other nations, what has been done so far constitutes a completed arrangement, that if Congress, in order to equalize both the burdens and the benefits of the arrangement among our own people, adds to our concessions without insisting upon additional concessions from Canada, then we must make the additional concessions to all countries with which we have treaties embracing the favored-nation clause.

I dispute both of these propositions, and insist that Congress is the only power which can make a proposal to Canada respecting tariff changes; that Congress ought to make just such a proposal as justice and the interest of our own people require, and that when such proposal is made by Congress and accepted by Canada, other nations can not inquire into the unauthorized negotiations carried on and the immaterial conclusions reached by our State Department, nor into the adequacy of the consideration which we accept for our concessions.

I must be clearly understood. Of course, no one claims that the House had not a strict legal right to pass whatever bill it pleased relating to our tariff with Canada, and no one claims that the Senate has not the technical power to amend the bill passed by the House to any extent that it sees fit, but the effort is to make these constitutional rights and powers barren and worthless by terrorizing both Congress and the country with the picture of the dismal consequences that will ensue if we do not ratify and vitalize the precise meeting of minds between Mr. Knox, our Secretary of State, and Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson, who represented the ministry of the Dominion of Canada.

My view of it is that the delusion created by the diplomatic exchanges ought to disappear; that the Senate ought to look upon the President's message as indicating his opinion respecting the legislation which should be had, entitled to great weight because of its high authority; that we ought to accept the letter of Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson as expressive of the opinion of two eminent gentlemen interested in Canada's welfare; that we ought to inform ourselves from every source of knowledge,



and having thus equipped ourselves for the performance of the duty before us we should make to Canada just such legislative proposal relating to changes in tariff duties as will be fair to our neighbor and beneficial to ourselves.

In order to fortify the opinions which I have ventured to lay before the Senate a brief retrospect will not, I am sure, be regarded as inappropriate. The President has the sole power to make treaties with foreign nations. Congress has the sole power to lay taxes, including the levying of duties on imports, and the sole power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Deferring for a moment the consideration of the question whether the treaty-making power can ever include the fixing of duties on imports without the authority of Congress, I submit:

First, that the arrangement before us, concluded upon the one side by the State Department of the United States and Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson upon the part of Canada, is not a treaty, and if the bill before us is passed and with the approval of the President becomes a law, it will not constitute a treaty between the two countries. It is to be observed that the President in his message, transmitted to Congress in the early part of the year, carefully refrains from describing it as a treaty. Referring to the two representatives of the Department of State who had been despatched by the department to Canada to confer upon the subject, he says:

They were authorized to take steps to formulate a reciprocal trade agreement.

And again, referring to the conclusion of their labors, he says:

The result of the negotiations was that on the 21st instant a reciprocal trade agreement was reached, the text of which I herewith transmit with accompanying correspondence and other data.

The two Canadian ministers, in their letter with attached schedules which, together with the acceptance on the part of the Secretary of State, constitutes whatever agreement was made, says:

2. We desire to set forth what we understand to be the contemplated arrangement, and to ask you to confirm it.

3. It is agreed that the desired tariff arrangement shall not take the formal shape of a treaty, but that the Governments of the two countries will use their utmost efforts to bring about such concurrent legislation at Washington and Ottawa.

It must be a little humiliating to the pride of Members of Congress to note that the Canadian ministers, in the passage I have quoted, as well as in the subsequent paragraph, refer to the Government of the United States as synonymous with the Executive Department of the United States, but in view of the occurrences of recent years it is not strange that foreigners should forget that Congress is a part of the Government of this country.

Recurring, however, to the subject in hand, it is quite clear that the persons who made the arrangement consciously refrained from denominating it as a treaty, and it must be assumed that they did it advisedly. A treaty is an international contract, and its very essence is the imposition of contractual obligations. A treaty without an obligation is as impossible as life without air. If the bill becomes a law there will be no promise, no obligation, on either side. Furthermore, if it be a treaty, which under the Constitution the Executive may make, the House of Representatives has no more authority to deal with it, or interfere with it, than it has with the nomination of a public officer, and before it could become effective the Senate must ratify it by a two-thirds vote. I must not, however, prolong the discussion by additional observations upon this phase of the matter, because it is not conceivable that the conclusions suggested will be disputed.

As I understand the scope of Executive activity, the only authority under which the President can enter into any agreement whatsoever with a foreign nation is the authority to make treaties. The Constitution does not repose in him the power to negotiate or make trade arrangements or agreements unless they are at the same time within the treaty-making authority, and I believe it to be true that for 57 years, at least, with possibly one exception, no President has ever attempted to change our tariff in a treaty without the previous authority of Congress.

Again I say that it must not be inferred from this analysis of the situation that I am assailing the motives of the executive department of the Government or seeking for the sake of criticism to question its authority. I am simply bringing to your attention what the President and the Secretary of State ought to be the first to concede, viz, that all that they have done has been solely for the information of Congress. If no Member of the House of Representatives had been willing to introduce a bill embodying the arrangement which has been agreed upon by the Secretary of State and the two Canadian ministers, it would have been legally impossible for the President to have invoked the action of the Senate upon it.

Mr. President, I am about to take up another phase of this matter, and, inasmuch as I have been speaking substantially for two hours and the day is rather oppressive, I will yield the floor, with the statement that I will endeavor to regain it at the close of the routine morning business to-morrow.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when adjournment occurred last evening I was discussing the Wilson bill with reference to the trade relations between the United States and Canada and the position of the Republican Party upon that bill. I am trying to find out, if I can, what has been the true doctrine of the Republican Party with reference to the particular matter about which we are now concerned.

I am now going to read a document which has been circulated in every Republican campaign since it was issued, including the campaign which brought the present administration into power. It constitutes a solemn pledge between the Republican organization and the agricultural interests of this country. It is a document which has been circulated not only generally but specifically in those States where the great farming vote is found. I have not been able myself to discover that change in the condition of facts and affairs which has changed the principle as we have laid it down from time to time in every campaign from 1864 until and including the campaign of three years ago. This is a portion of the document:

Not content with the injury these proposed changes would work to the Pacific coast, it is proposed that the protective duties on many agricultural products provided for by the McKinley bill and previous legislation shall be removed, the barrier which we have erected against agricultural productions from Canada and other foreign countries broken down, and American farmers placed in free competition with Canadian producers. The provision of the Wilson bill in this regard may be briefly stated, as follows:

"Buckwheat, corn or maize, corn meal, oats, oatmeal, rye, rye flour, wheat, and wheat flour are to pay a duty of 20 per cent; but each of the above articles shall be admitted free of duty from any country which imposes no import duty on the like product when exported from the United States."

That is the provision which incurred the displeasure and the continued denouncement of the Republican organization from the time it was put in the Wilson bill until we took it out by the pledge which we made to the American farmer that we would take it out if we were given the power, and the American farmer gave us the power and we immediately proceeded to change it in the Dingley bill.

Of course, no country importing largely of our agricultural products will impose a duty upon them, and this provision of the Wilson bill means free trade with Canada and with all other countries in the articles mentioned. Barley, under the McKinley bill, is subject to a duty of 30 cents per bushel, which has had the effect of limiting the amount of barley imported from Canada and stimulating its production by our farmers. But by the Wilson bill barley, barley malt, and barley pearled, patent, or hulled is subjected to a duty of only 20 per cent ad valorem. Duties upon live animals are largely decreased by the Wilson bill and fixed at 20 per cent ad valorem. Duties upon dairy products and upon beans, peas, hay, potatoes, and other vegetables which are not placed upon the free list are largely reduced. The duty is reduced upon raisins and other dried grapes to 1½ cents per pound. Apples, green or ripe; apples, dried, desiccated, or evaporated; bacon and hams; beef, mutton, and pork, and meats of all kinds; prepared or preserved birds, and land and water fowls; cabbages; eggs and yolks of eggs; fish and insects; fresh fish; and many other products of agriculture are placed upon the free list.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. DIXON. I should like to know what document the Senator from Idaho is now reading?

Mr. BORAH. I am reading from a speech delivered by Senator Dolph in 1894, and which was afterwards used as a campaign document by the Republican national organization.

Mr. DIXON. It was circulated as a Republican campaign document?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir; and I presume that almost every Republican campaign speaker used it as a reference from time to time. It was a document which was well known to the Republican organization, and, as I said, it has been in constant use. Mr. Dolph said further:

Putting iron ore, coal, lumber, and the principal agricultural products on the free list will be especially disastrous to the belt of agricultural, lumbering, and mining States along the Canadian border. Under the House bill, if it should become a law, we would have free trade in these articles with Canada. Extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific the United States and Canada lie side by side, divided only by an imaginary line, with similar forests and mines, with the same character of soil, but with cheaper lands, cheaper labor, and more undeveloped resources upon the Canadian side. It is proposed to throw down the barrier which had protected agriculture in the United States and compelled the Canadians to contribute largely to our Treasury and to admit the products of the cheaper soil and cheaper labor of Canada into the United States free. It is proposed that we shall make an exceedingly foolish bargain with Canada and give her the markets of 67,000,000 people for the privilege of sending free certain agricultural products into a country having 5,000,000 people.



This was, of course, a speech made in 1894, and there is a larger population at the present time.

But this disproportion between the population of the two countries is not the worst feature of the proposed reciprocity. The raw products of Canada and those of the United States are substantially the same. Reciprocity with Canada would mean a very different thing from the reciprocity with Mexico or South American countries, from which, with reciprocity, we might get in exchange for our products products of those countries which we do not produce; but with the duty removed or reduced upon the products of the forest, the mines, and the soil of Canada, the only result will be to make farming profitable in Canada, to increase the amount of Canadian products annually exported to the United States, to crowd out of our home markets a like amount of our own products. The amount of Canadian imports will not greatly affect prices in the United States, but will affect domestic production and relieve the Canadian producers from the burden of paying duties at our ports. It will result in benefiting the Canadian producer, in loss to our Treasury and to American farmers exposed to Canadian competition.

Our tariff upon agricultural products has made farming unprofitable in Canada, has protected farmers on our northern frontier from undue competition with Canadian products, has added greatly to our revenues, contributed, as everyone admits, by the Canadian producer, has caused such a difference in the prosperity of the two countries as to induce a very large immigration of the most industrious, enterprising citizens of the Dominion to the United States. All these advantages are to be absolutely thrown away without any compensating benefits, and only to carry out an unsound theory concerning free trade in raw materials. Our people are to be farther taxed; new schemes of taxation are to be devised to make them contribute to the revenues the amount which, under existing laws, is now contributed by Canadians.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. May I ask the Senator from Idaho whether, in his opinion, the condition mentioned in the speech which he is reading now prevails, that the prosperity in the United States is so great that we are enjoying a great immigration from Canada at the present time of Canadians dissatisfied with their condition?

Mr. BORAH. It was stated on the floor yesterday that some 94,000 Canadians had come to this country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. However, it was also stated yesterday that a much larger number of Americans were leaving the United States and going to Canada to enjoy their greater prosperity.

Mr. BORAH. That is due to the fact of cheaper lands in Canada. But the emigration from Canada to this country is due undoubtedly to the fact that the Canadians desired to secure work in our manufacturing centers. Those are the points to which they go. But our farmers are leaving their farms in this country and taking Canadian farms.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator think it is just to say that when the immigration is coming from Canada into the United States it indicates a greater prosperity in the United States, but when the tide of emigration is the other way and is going from the United States into Canada it does not indicate that they have a degree of prosperity which is attractive even to the people of the United States?

Mr. BORAH. If the people who come from Canada into the United States come here to engage in the same kind of occupation that the people who leave the United States go to Canada to engage in, the argument of the Senator from Nebraska would be conclusive; but we are engaged here in legislation which disparages the American farmer, which accentuates the movement of the American farmer to Canada, and which, on the other hand, accentuates the movement of the Canadian to the manufacturing centers of the United States. That is precisely the vice of the measure.

That is precisely the injustice, the inequity, and the unfairness of this legislation. It is designed to place an additional embarrassment, an additional hardship, upon the American farmer, and therefore will tend to drive the American farmer to the Canadian side or to the city and manufacturing centers. On the other hand, it will be a benefit, as is supposed, to the American manufacturer and would naturally call for a Canadian to come into the manufacturing centers to find employment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I realize that that is the argument made by the Senator from Idaho and others who agree with him; but I call his attention to the fact that he is reading now to the Senate an argument against reciprocity based upon the fact that conditions in the United States at the time the speech was delivered which he is reading were so much more prosperous, as proved by the immigration from Canada into the United States, whereas at the present time, as we all know, that particular condition is exactly reversed; and I am asking him whether that argument has any application at all at the present time.

Mr. BORAH. I do not agree with the proposition so universally stated by the Senator from Nebraska, that the reverse

of that proposition is now true. It is reversed as to a particular avocation, but not as a general proposition.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BORAH. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho if the immigration into Canada at present is not almost exclusively the result of the cheap lands that are being opened up in Saskatchewan and Alberta?

Mr. BORAH. There are several causes, in my judgment, contributing to the emigration to Canada. One of the principal reasons for the emigration is the tenacity with which the American Congress holds on to the antiquated land laws of the United States. Canada has made the acquisition of land in her dominion easy, comparatively speaking. A party may go into Canada and acquire a homestead by three years' residence, and he has permission to leave that homestead six months out of each year. The acquisition of public lands in Canada has been made comparatively easy, especially when a comparison is made with the United States. That has been one of the elements.

In addition to that there is another element. I am not stating it as a matter of criticism or of commendation; I let that take care of itself at some other time; but we have included in our reserves in the West some thirty-five or forty million acres of agricultural lands; and the western immigrant will not contend with the rules and regulations and conditions of acquiring a homestead in such a reserve when he can go across the Canadian border and acquire a homestead more easily and without the embarrassments which surround him here.

Then, thirdly, there is undoubtedly the proposition of cheaper lands. Lands are cheaper in Canada, whether you estimate the value from the standpoint of the manner of acquisition under the law or from the manner of purchase. Those things have contributed to the result.

Since 1900, 500,000 American farmers have left the American side and gone to the Canadian side to acquire farms. Five hundred thousand of the best brawn and blood of the western civilization have passed over to become citizens, at least landholders and farmers, upon the Canadian side. That not only represents the manhood but it represents the wealth which those men carried with them and the possibility of the great wealth which they are to create.

I do not understand, Mr. President, why it should be thought wise statesmanship to accentuate the immigration from the United States into Canada. I do not understand why it should be thought the part of wisdom to add an additional inducement for the American settler to go to Canada instead of remaining in the United States. I do not understand why it should be thought wise, not only in view of his advantage by reason of the cheaper land, but why it should be thought wise to give the additional advantage of having cheaper lands and the better advantages without sustaining the burdens of government which we have to sustain in this country.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield further to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. What I wished particularly to emphasize was the fact that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was wrong in this particular, to wit, that the prosperity of this country was not inducing immigration from Canada. Those of us who live near the border know that there is a constant tide from Canada coming into the United States for one reason and another. Were it not for the fact of the cheaper land proposition, which has just been explained by the Senator from Idaho, there would be no doubt that the immigration from Canada would be several times as large as the tide from the United States into the Canadian Provinces.

Mr. BORAH. I have no doubt that is true. Mr. Dolph continued:

The McKinley bill considerably increased the duties on many agricultural products, protected and stimulated agriculture in the United States, increased taxation upon importations of Canadian products into this country; but under the House bill this policy is to be reversed. This is but another example of the insincerity of the Democratic Party when it professes friendship for the farmer and laboring man.

And now the Republican Party must take its position alongside the Democratic Party in its insincerity to the American farmer.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. BORAH. I do.



Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, I am in some doubt as to whether my colleague intends to say that the Republican Party will do it or is doing it. Some Republicans may be doing it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am glad my colleague makes that distinction. There is some consolation, some balm, in that suggestion, but very little. I wish there were more.

Mr. President, I desire to read another paragraph or two from the speech of former Senator Dolph before I proceed, as I know the Senate is very anxious to hear it. He said further:

The blow threatened against manufacturers is to fall and expend itself at last upon the producers of raw materials, upon the agricultural and laboring classes. But let no one be deceived. The blow at the farmer, the lumberman, the miner, and the laborer, while it will fall first upon them, will reach and be felt by every industry, by all classes and all sections. Why is it proposed to put wool on the free list and to destroy an industry which has heretofore afforded a living to 150,000 small farmers in this country and employment for as many additional laborers; an industry which has made farming profitable upon portions of the rugged soil of the Eastern States not adapted to agriculture, and enables the mountain regions of California, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah to be utilized? Why destroy an industry which with proper protection would eventually make this the most extensive wool-producing country in the world and enable us to furnish the raw materials for our own manufacturers?

As the result of the legislation proposed by the House bill, the flocks that graze upon the mountain sides of the great West, and the smaller flocks of the smaller farmers of the East, will be driven to the slaughter pen, the woolgrowing industry will be destroyed, thousands of laborers thrown out of employment, thousands of farmers ruined, and all to make a market for the wool of Australia and South American countries, raised upon cheap lands with cheap labor and with climatic advantages we do not possess.

But, Mr. President, there came a time in this country when it was a noticeable fact that the great voting strength of this country was in the cities, and also a noticeable fact that the great strength of the press was in the cities, and both the political parties began to play for that influence. Elections are now controlled by the cities and public opinion molded by the great dailies. The result of it is that the contest upon the tariff question to-day is between the centers of population and the producing or agricultural class. The geographical taint or division which once characterized the fight has practically disappeared, and for the purpose of securing that great strength in political marts it would appear that both parties have concluded that the proper thing to do is to put raw material of all kinds upon the free list and to leave undisturbed those articles which are controlled by corporations, combines, and trusts, which have been collecting toll upon everything that leaves the farm and goes to the consumers. We begin our revision with the man outside the trust. Instead of attacking the powerful monopolies which fix prices, regardless of State lines or national lines; instead of a brave effort to restore competition or to regulate prices, we adopt the temporizing, deceptive plan of putting cheaper raw material into the hoppers of the trust, hoping, apparently, that the unconscionable combines will become satiated to satiety and give the consumer some of the benefits. I feel so earnestly and so bitterly at this shirking of a great responsibility and of the restraining language of debate is utterly unfit for the occasion.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Idaho if, instead of saying "both of the political parties," he should not say "the Democratic Party and the administration"? I am not willing to concede that President Taft, in the crusade in which he is now engaged for free trade in agricultural products, represents the Republican Party of this Nation.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, I do not get very much consolation out of that, either. In any event, I prefer not to deal with individuals.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I want to join the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] in his protest, but I put it on a different basis than did the Senator in his observation. I am unwilling to admit that as to the Democratic Party, and to commit them to a policy of opposition to any reduction of duties on manufactured articles. We favor such reduction now, and have always favored it, and we expect before long to be cooperating with the Senator from Idaho in a very substantial reduction of duties.

Mr. BORAH. The amount of consolation which I am getting out of this debate is very exhilarating on this hot afternoon. But how subtly and dextrously the Democratic Party leaves to

the last the great trust-controlled articles, and with what scientific malevolence it reaches, like a professional garroter, the jugular vein of the producer.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. In response to the last suggestion of the Senator from Idaho, that the President possibly did represent the Republican Party, I desire to say, with the permission of the Senator, that the President does not represent the majority of the Republican Members of Congress of the other House, he does not represent a majority of the Republican membership of the United States Senate, and I believe that the Senator from Idaho will agree with me that he does not represent the sentiments of a majority of the Republicans in this Nation.

Mr. BORAH. I presume I am permitted to remain silent upon that subject. I did not suppose two months ago that the President represented a majority of the Republicans in this particular matter, but the kaleidoscopic change is such that I am unwilling to become a prophet at this time. I am not sure just exactly what strength the President represents. Neither am I sure of anything except that nearly all Senators are for this agreement, but none want it.

Mr. President, I want to read a single paragraph from the memoirs of John Sherman. I should like for all my Republican friends to listen, and especially the leader of the Republican administration, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. [Laughter]. Mr. Sherman says in the first volume of his memoirs, page 191:

The dogma of some manufacturers that raw materials should be admitted free of duty is far more dangerous to the protective policy than the opposition of free traders. The latter contend that no duties should be levied to protect domestic industry but for revenue only, while the former demand protection for their industries, but refuse to give to the farmer and miner the benefit of even revenue duties. A denial of protection on coal, iron, wool, and other so-called raw materials will lead to the denial of protection to machinery, to textiles, to pottery, and other industries. The labor of one class must not be sacrificed to secure higher protection for another class. The earth and all that is within it is the work of God. The labor of man that tends to develop the resources buried in the earth is entitled to the same favor and protection as skilled labor in the highest branch of industry, and if this is not granted impartially the doctrine of protection proclaimed by the founders of our Government, supported for more than a hundred years of wonderful progress, will be sacrificed by the hungry greed of selfish corporations, who ask protection for great establishments and refuse to grant it to the miner, the laborer, and the farmer.

I wish we might heed it. I know it is true; you all know it is true; yet, sir, we are without the courage to do the right, even when we know the right.

That is a very wholesome piece of Republican philosophy.

I have very great sympathy, Mr. President, with the attitude of the newspapers in this fight. I am aware that they have been struggling and contending with a great corporation or combine which in a large measure controls the product which they need in their business. I presume that every right-thinking man has looked upon that subject in sympathy with the press of the country. That must necessarily be true with the "Progressives," because a "Progressive" can not refuse to sympathize with the press any more than a Mohammedan can pray with his face turned from Mecca. "The press is a part of the uplift."

But, Mr. President, what benefit will it be if, after all, this trust or combine should move north as rapidly as the Republican Party in its beneficence gives over our markets to foreigners? What hindrance will there be upon the part of this organization or combination to control all the additional raw material which we are seeking now to put into the market? By what means do we hope to secure relief against this combine operating in Canada, if we can not secure relief against it operating in our own country within the jurisdiction of our own laws? Instead of pouring more raw material in the hopper of the trust and exchanging the farmer's opportunity and his chance in the trade, why not deal with the combination itself? If, as has been stated in public several times, the real opposition to this reciprocity agreement comes from the Paper Trust and the Timber Trust, would it not be wise, knowing that they do exist, to deal with them as trusts and combinations, instead of undertaking to extend the area of their operation, for they can operate across the governmental line as easily as they can across a State line?

It seems to me, Mr. President, that if we would devote our attention to a suit, both civil and criminal, against the combinations, if they exist, which control this product, it would be far more effective to the newspapers and those who want to deal with them, and it would not be nearly so expensive to the agricultural interests of the country. But the fact is that



Canada saw an opportunity to get into the American market, and she required that the American Government concede her entrance into this market before she would grant the favor which we seem to think will be of some benefit to us, and which, in my judgment, will not, in the long run, be any benefit at all. Instead, however, of dealing with the combination or the trust as a trust, we undertake to settle the trust question at the customhouse—a thing to my mind impossible. Instead of subjecting them to the criminal law and placing them where they ought to be, if they are exercising the power that it is claimed they exercise, we enter into an engagement with Canada by which, if they see fit, they can extend their operations and control the situation just as effectively after as they did before the agreement.

Mr. President, the only man who has never been in a trust and has never dealt with trust goods, except as he purchased them, who has never entered a combine, who has received the least benefit of all from the protective-tariff system, who has been removed farthest from its direct benefit, is the man who is to be visited with the discrimination in this instance in the hope of settling the trust question by tariff legislation, to wit, the American farmer. How can we justify in good conscience in beginning our attack upon the one who stands in the open field of competition, who is not in a combination to control prices—the farmer? We put him upon an absolute free-trade basis and then say that sometime in that far off and most illusive sometime we will deal with the real wrongdoer—the one who really fixes the price to the consumer.

Some 25 years ago both the Republican and the Democratic Parties began their campaign against trusts and combinations, seeking to devise laws and schemes by means of which they could control them or destroy them, and that campaign has continued from year to year until practically the present time. It was thought that if they could be destroyed or controlled competition would be restored to the American market place, and through competition prices would be brought back to a reasonable level. But, Mr. President, it seems that, after all, during all these years we have been mistaken; that trusts were not the cause of the high prices; that the combines were not the ones who were fixing toll upon the things which we eat; but the man who has been guilty of all these things which have led to the high cost of living has been the farmer out upon the ranch. Now, we have turned our attention from proceeding against the combines and trusts under the criminal law to putting the farmers' product upon the free list in the hope that by giving the trusts more raw material they will have compassion upon the consumer. This is one of the stupendous jokes of this era.

If it will not disturb some of my Republican friends, I think I shall read the view of a prominent Republican upon the matter of settling the trust question by the tariff. This is from ex-President Roosevelt. He was a good Republican at the time the present administration was elected:

At the outset it is worth while to say a word as to the attempt to identify the question of tariff revision or tariff reduction with a solution of the trust question. This is always a sign of desire to avoid any real effort to deal adequately with the trust question. In speaking on this point at Minnesota on April 4, 1903, I said:

"The question of tariff revision, speaking broadly, stands wholly apart from the question of dealing with the trusts. No change in tariff duties can have any substantial effect in solving the so-called trust problem. Certain great trusts or great corporations are wholly unaffected by the tariff. Almost all the others that are of any importance have, as a matter of fact, numbers of smaller American competitors; and, of course, a change in the tariff which would work injury to the large corporation would work not merely injury but destruction to its smaller competitors, and equally, of course, such a change would mean disaster to all the wageworkers connected with either the large or the small corporations. From the standpoint of those interested in the solution of the trust problem, such a change would therefore merely mean that the trust was relieved of the competition of its weaker American competitors and thrown only into competition with foreign competitors, and that the first effort to meet this new competition would be made by cutting down wages, and would therefore be primarily at the cost of labor. In the case of some of our greatest trusts such a change might confer upon them a positive benefit. Speaking broadly, it is evident that the changes in the tariff will affect the trusts for weal or for woe simply as they affect the whole country. The tariff affects trusts only as it affects all other interests. It makes all these interests, large or small, profitable, and its benefits can be taken from the large only under penalty of taking them from the small also."

There is little for me to add to this. It is but 10 years since the last attempt was made, by means of lowering the tariff, to prevent some people from prospering too much. The attempt was entirely successful. The tariff law of that year was among the causes which in that year and for some time afterwards effectually prevented anybody from prospering too much and labor from prospering at all. Undoubtedly it would be possible at the present time to prevent any of the trusts from remaining prosperous by the simple expedient of making such a sweeping change in the tariff as to paralyze the industries of the country. The trusts would cease to prosper, but their smaller competitors would be ruined and the wageworkers would starve, while it would not pay the farmer to haul his produce to market. The evils connected with the trusts can be reached only by rational effort, step by step, along the lines taken by Congress and the Executive during the past three years. If a tariff law is passed under which the country prospers, as the coun-

try has prospered under the present tariff law, then all classes will share in the prosperity. If a tariff law is passed aimed at preventing the prosperity of some of our people, it is as certain as anything can be that this aim will be achieved only by cutting down the prosperity of all of our people.

Mr. President, I want to talk for a few moments about the father of reciprocity.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, may I interrupt my colleague before he leaves that phase of the matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. HEYBURN. My memory just went back in connection with the extract from the speech being read by the Senator to 1900, which is not very far, and I thought I remembered a plank in a platform of a great party which runs:

Tariff laws should be amended by putting the products of trusts upon the free list to prevent monopoly under the plea of protection.

That is from the Democratic platform of 1900, and it is well enough to remember it.

Mr. BORAH. I was talking to the family to-day, and not to the opposition. I want to settle this question among ourselves. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I want to talk for a few moments about the father of reciprocity. I would not detract from anybody's glory, and I am not intending to do so, but the real author of reciprocity in this country of late years is Mr. James J. Hill. I speak of Mr. Hill with the utmost respect because I think he is not only a great railroad man but a great man in other respects. He is a man of wonderful ability both as a railroad builder and, as has been said, an "empire builder"—a man whose capacity and intellect goes far beyond the question of the manipulation of stocks and the construction of railroads. I speak of him in this connection as a matter of history and not for the purpose of attacking him. He is entitled to his views. In my judgment, to him belongs the success, in a large measure, for the movement for reciprocity in this country within the last five years. He has been an advocate of it in season and out of season; he has furnished all the arguments I have ever, as yet, heard advanced in its behalf. However great a man Mr. Hill is, we ought to remember that the success of his great railroad system depends in a large measure upon the chance of hauling Canadian products to our markets. He was the man who invented the argument that by putting the farmer's product upon the free list you could reduce the cost of living without reducing the cost of the farmer's product. I am sure that no mind, except the ingenious mind of Mr. Hill, would ever have conceived of the proposition that you could reduce the cost of living by putting the farmer's product upon the free list without reducing the price of the product to the farmer.

This required a bold genius as well as some audacity. He has both. He is also the author of the argument that while the products which would be brought from Canada would be so small and of such a minimum amount that they would not affect the price to the farmer, yet they would be so large and so immeasurable that it would make it impossible for the speculator to control and corner the market. This class of arguments, which will fit in one locality or to one audience and then, stated differently, be usable in another locality, will be found in his many articles upon the question of reciprocity.

He published a book some two years ago. Among other subjects he treated the subject of reciprocity with Canada. I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read the entire book, but I should like to read some parts of it:

Since the episode of Maximilian our interest in Mexico has been scarcely more than a friendly observation of growth along lines so different, in the main, from our own that the question of conflicting interests could scarcely arise. On the north has arisen a confederation so closely akin to us in all respects, so remarkable in recent expansion and promise, so well worth taking note of either as a helper or a competitor in American continental development, that the question of our trade relations with the Dominion of Canada is one of the most practical issues of the day.

The interests of these two peoples are as similar as the territories which they occupy. Place a pair of dividers, with one leg on Chicago and the other at Key West, swing the latter to the northwest, and it will not reach the limit of good agricultural land. Nature knows no artificial boundaries. "Classing the United States and Canada together," says Mr. Edward Atkinson, "occupying nearly the whole continent, it may be observed that the English-speaking people of this vast domain will constitute the only great nation producing a large excess of every kind of food that is essential for the support of life." Here are to be found, also, the largest known deposits of nearly all the useful metals, much precious ore, the greatest existing body of valuable and accessible timber, and other natural resources. No parallel of latitude marks where one form of wealth ends. The great central plain of North America is a physical unit. The characteristic and imposing feature of the interior of this continent is its material integrity. The two countries have identical languages, customs, usages of trade, and agencies for development. In all that relates to their progress there is a natural oneness and necessary harmony as obvious as the unbroken extent of land that stretches north to the limit of settlement.



How familiar those sentences sound to those who have been listening to or reading public speeches in favor of this question. Who ever supposed that this vision, which encompasses an English-speaking continent bound together in bonds of brotherly love, had its origin in the mind of a rugged railroad builder, whose railroads lead from Canadian fields to American markets. Perish the thought. That vision from the empyrean could never have originated in so materialistic a realm.

And what has this sturdy young neighbor of the North put into a partnership?

And then, without going into the long list of figures which he gives, I read again from page 94:

The agricultural interest in both countries would benefit by freedom of markets. Our cities afford a market for everything that the Canadian farmer can furnish. His breadstuffs, cattle and meat supplies, butter, cheese, eggs, and wool would reach new consumers.

That is, the Canadian farmer.

In 1906 Canada exported to the United States 3,831,988 bushels of wheat, valued at \$2,981,608, according to her official statistics. This is an average price of 77 cents per bushel. In the same year the United States exported 34,973,291 bushels of wheat, valued at \$28,757,517, or an average price of 82 cents per bushel, according to her official statistics. The average price of No. 2 red winter wheat that year in the New York market was 86½ cents per bushel. This difference is not always the same, nor does it exist at all times; but it is true that the price on the American side is usually from 3 to 5 cents greater than on the Canadian. Would this prospective gain to the Canadian farmer involve a corresponding loss to the farmer of the United States? Not at all. The time has now arrived when the home demand for many of the products of the soil is greater than he can supply.

And yet, Mr. President, those who are interested in this subject and will turn to another subject in this book will find that he gives the facts and figures to show that the American people can produce, if they are minded to use the land which is here at hand to be used, from twice to three times the amount of wheat we are producing now, and he shows that we can produce sufficient wheat to satisfy the home market when we shall have arrived at a population of 200,000,000 people.

Mr. President, that is one of the prime objections, to my mind, to this entire proposition. The untold millions of acres of agricultural land not now under cultivation which would be placed under cultivation if proper inducement were had in the way of prices is far more desirable than that we should trade with the foreigner who produces the same class of articles.

The American manufacturer has no better customer than the American farmer. He will sell more to an American farmer than he will to a Canadian farmer. The American farmer will not only purchase more, but he helps to sustain the burdens of American government. Can there be any possible doubt that any proposition which would tend to send the farmer across the line would be a detriment to the American manufacturer in the end? Would he not rather deal with a hundred farmers upon this side than a hundred farmers upon the other side?

The time has now arrived when the home demand for many of the products of the soil is greater than he can supply.

Mr. President, that is almost the exact language used by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Root] the other day, when he said that he was of the opinion that heretofore the farmer had not received very much direct benefit from the protective tariff. Not, said the Senator, at least, until late years. With what wonderful accuracy of language and with what remorseless logic the Senator from New York states the real infamy of this legislation! The American farmer has not received any benefit except incidental benefit from the protective-tariff system until within the last few years and since the demand in the home market is becoming sufficient to raise the price of his products to that point where he can secure a competency and realize something from the system which he has loyally sustained—since that period has arrived the selfishness of the great manufacturing centers propose to take from him his long-deferred profits. And a more accurate and complete indictment against this agreement could not and has not been stated than that which was contained in the single sentence of the Senator from New York.

It seems to me that the Republican organization is now in a position where it must either recognize the falsity of the economic principles which it has been preaching and the economic principles which it has announced for 40 years, or admit that this is a cold and brutal betrayal of the most loyal constituency that a party organization ever had.

If it be true that the farmers have stood loyal as they have to this organization for 40 years, in the hope and in the belief that they would build up an American market place close to their homes from which and by which they could realize a competency, and if it further be true that just as that is being realized and conceded it is to be traded off and turned over to foreign producers, there is no page of political history from

Sir Robert Peel to this hour that is equal in its betrayal by the Republican Party of this great rural, loyal constituency.

Mr. HEYBURN. Would it interrupt my colleague—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to his colleague?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. To call attention to something within the family.

In the last national platform on which this administration went into power it is written under the head of "The Farmer":

Among those whose welfare is as vital to the welfare of the whole country as is that of the wageworkers is the American farmer. The prosperity of the country rests peculiarly upon the prosperity of agriculture. The Republican Party during the last 12 years has accomplished extraordinary work in bringing the resources of the National Government to the aid of the farmer, not only in advancing agriculture itself, but in increasing the conveniences of rural life.

That is within the family.

Mr. BORAH. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I agree with the bold figure of speech used by the gifted Senator from Oklahoma the other day when he said that the veil of the temple of protection has been rent in twain from top to bottom. But the rending of the temple was made possible not by outward enemies, though they gave aid and comfort; it was made possible by a base and venal betrayal for 30 shekels of silver—by a betrayal from one who had been a follower and a disciple. The eastern manufacturer, standing in the midst of the American market place, an advocate and a disciple of this system, its first and greatest beneficiary, in his selfishness and greed, covets his 30 additional shekels of silver and betrays the only system which offers him salvation. But I remember also following this figure further; that after the veil of the temple was rent asunder; after they parted the garments and cast lots; after there was darkness and desolation and despair upon the face of the earth from the sixth to the ninth hour; after Judas had brought his 30 shekels of silver and thrown them upon the temple floor and had gone and hanged himself; then came the resurrection morning; and the veil of the temple was restored and stands unshaken until this day. All this, sir, we may have to endure, and I believe we shall. But in the end the American laborer will not be placed upon the same basis with the foreign laborer; American citizenship will always mean more than the citizenship of other countries. In the end the home market will belong alone to the American producers. The inequities of the system will be adjusted, but its principles maintained.

Mr. President, one thing is just as certain as time marks progress—that the protective-tariff system will stand as a whole or it will fall as a whole. The Senator from New York said that those who represented the agricultural States would in time forget their revenges and vote for the general good of the country. The Senator will not be permitted to put it upon the ground of revenge. The basis of the condemnation will be its injustice, that when you take away from the American producer the American market place and trade it to a foreigner the cornerstone of this great system has been taken out and it will fall just so surely as that transpires. There is only one hope against that proposition, and that is the fact that this scheme, which would so barter away the home market, will have only a short life to live.

Mr. President, it can not be too often stated that the protective policy is a system. It is especially important to bear this in mind at a time when we have before us the distinct proposition of discriminating against a certain class of our people and still seemingly nursing the delusion that we can maintain the protective policy as such. If protection is to be confined to this or that particular article or schedule, if it is to be so applied as to reach to a certain class and to the disadvantage of other classes of our citizens, if the manufacturer is to have its benefits and the farmer denied, it then becomes nothing more than a privilege, and a privilege is always wrong.

If it be true that under protection as a system we build up and diversify our industries, diversify and specialize labor, and thereby increase the compensation of labor; if it be true that it establishes a home market for the surplus products of the soil and thereby serves both the producer and the consumer, it can well be justified and defended as a great national policy. But if it is to be used to build up one class at the expense of another; if the manufacturer is to be protected and the agriculturist not; if the home market is to be built up, not for the American farmer but for the foreign agriculturist, then it is an outrageous privilege and can not be defended and will not long be maintained. The latter proposition makes perfectly consistent those who are advocating reciprocity but who do not believe in protection. There is no bet-



ter way to destroy protection than by reciprocity as to competing products. It must either be a system and so applied as to benefit all classes and include the whole country or it is not justified upon any right theory of government whatever.

The real foes of the protective policy are those who would make an exception in favor of or against a particular industry. There is nothing either in constitutional law or in morals by which you can properly lay a tax to sustain an industry or to enable an industry to live when otherwise it could not live, and thereby, in a sense, tax one individual for the benefit of another, except upon the theory that as a policy or system it develops our natural resources, diversifies our industries, gives employment to the different dispositions and desires of men, and creates and maintains a home market for the products of the soil. Upon any other principle the protective system is a wrong, if not a fraud. Those who argue for free raw material or free products from the farm, and still seek to maintain protective duties upon manufactured goods, belong to that class of people who are perfectly willing to see the Government used to the aggrandizement of one class over another. But their selfishness is not their most striking peculiarity or quality, because their shortsightedness is a more distinguishing trait than that of their selfishness. While the temporary or immediate effects will press more severely upon one class of our people than others, in the end such a one-sided, narrow, selfish, and shortsighted policy will impoverish all lines of industry by destroying the entire system. If there is anything for which the original founders of the protective policy contended above all others it was that it should be treated as a system and that the home market should at all times belong to the American producer.

It was one of the cardinal principles of the protective theory from the beginning that the home market was extended and steadied by protection and that this home market was to serve the agricultural interests of the country, that manufacturers were necessary and essential for the agriculturist, and that, upon the other hand, agriculture was indispensable for the success of the manufacturer. I call attention to some statements from some of the leading spirits upon this subject from the beginning. Alexander Hamilton said:

This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is of the first consequence. It is of all things that which most efficiently conduces to a flourishing state of agriculture. \* \* \* To secure such a market there is no other expedient than to promote manufacturing establishments. Manufacturers, who constitute the most numerous class after the cultivators of land, are for that reason the principal consumers of the surplus of their labor. \* \* \* It is a maxim well established by experience that the aggregate prosperity of manufactures and the aggregate prosperity of agriculture are intimately connected. Perhaps the superior steadiness of the demand of a domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is alone a convincing argument of its truth.

No one has ever added anything to the argument of Alexander Hamilton in favor of the American protective tariff system. Indeed, it is not too much to say that all the great speeches which have ever been made upon the subject are in some measure an amplification of that famous report made by Mr. Hamilton when he was Secretary of the Treasury. It was the wont of his marvelous intellect to exhaust whatever subject it deigned to touch.

Benjamin Franklin said:

Every manufacture encouraged in our own country makes a home market and saves so much money to the country that must otherwise be exported. \* \* \* It seems to the interest of all our farmers and owners of land to encourage home manufactures in preference to foreign ones imported from different countries.

Thomas Jefferson said:

We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. Jefferson was an agriculturist, not only theoretically, but in fact an agriculturist.

The above statement of Mr. Jefferson contains a vast amount of philosophy. If it were not for the healthy, wholesome life of our agricultural regions, if the politics of the country were throughout as corrupt as they are in the great centers of population, our Government would not survive half a century. The farm not only supplies the city with food, but it is a remarkable fact that the farm supplies the city with brains and character. If it were not for the constant accession from the farm to the city of young men, the effect would be felt not only in business and in politics, but in the stature of the citizenship in a decade. The finest eulogy ever written upon one class of people is the eulogy upon the agricultural class contained in *Who's Who in America*. If you will take up that volume you will find that 75 per cent of the men in this Chamber and in high official life were born and reared upon a farm. You will find 95 per cent of the editors of the great cosmopolitan dailies born either upon a farm or in country villages; and of the lawyers and great merchants and railroad operators you will find an average of over 75 per cent. So the declaration of Mr. Jefferson was not

only one touching the economics, but it is one of great wisdom, covering every feature of national life.

Again, Mr. Jefferson says:

My idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw material. \* \* \* I trust the good sense of our country will see that its greatest prosperity depends upon a due balance between agriculture, manufacture, and commerce.

Henry Clay, in the great debate of 1824, said:

The greatest want of civilized society is a market for the sale and exchange of the surplus of the produce of the labor of its members. \* \* \* The home market is first in order and paramount in importance.

Again he says:

Agriculture is our greatest interest. It ought to be ever predominant. All others should bend to it. And in considering what is for its advantage we should contemplate it in all its varieties of planting, farming, and grazing. \* \* \* Still cherishing the foreign market, let us create also a home market to give further scope to the consumption of the produce of American industries.

Mr. McKinley said:

The home market, created by increased manufactures, encouraged by protective tariff, has changed the condition of the agriculturists of the country to their advantage and profit whether they grow cotton or corn, wheat or wool. This system has given to the farmers the best domestic market anywhere offered. \* \* \* There is no portion of our people except labor which would be so seriously affected in income and profits from the policy of free trade as the farmer.

How much worse, then, is free trade to the farmer and protection to the manufacturer?

\* \* \* Nothing can be so disastrous to the American farmer as the surrender of the home market for the farm. \* \* \* The value of every farm is increased by its nearness to a manufacturing center which is a home consumer. \* \* \* The closer you can bring the field of production to the field of consumption the better it will be for the purchaser and the consumer.

Mr. Webster said:

If by an importation of British manufactures we encourage the production of the articles manufactured in Europe rather than in America and bringing the goods here to the United States, is that not certain to diminish the number of consumers. So that after all it comes to this, whether it is better for our agriculturists to have the home market than to have a foreign market.

Now, I should like to ask my Republican brothers where is there to be found a page, a paragraph, a line in any Republican platform or any Republican document from the beginning of the party to the present time that is not in condemnation, not only not in support but in condemnation, of this policy or this measure which we are now discussing.

I wait, Mr. President, for some Republican to rise in his place and set before the Senate a single principle advocated at any time by any administration in support of this agreement which is now placed here to be passed without a single amendment.

The administration now in power came into power under a solemn pledge to protect the American market for the American farmer and to increase the market of the American farmer.

Senator Roor, a leader in the last administration, Republican leader in this administration, declared in his great speech in the convention in 1904 that it was the pledge of the Republican Party, among other things—

To increase the profit of the farmer's toil, to protect the farmer's product and extend his market, and to improve the condition of the farmer's life.

How does that harmonize with his effort to decrease the farmer's profit, to take away the farmer's protection, and to destroy the farmer's market, and to make harder the condition of the farmer's life? Every single proposition stated in that brief paragraph is now controverted by our present plans.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. No Republican seems disposed to accept the Senator's challenge to the effect that no Republican platform or speech or document ever sanctioned this treaty. I want, in the interest of accuracy, to call his attention to the fact that the President of the United States, whom the senior Senator from Idaho said came into power—I did not precisely understand why he wanted to distinguish between election and coming into power; it may be that he did not intend any distinction—but that President elected, as I say, coming into power, as he says, in two messages has advocated this, and in his first message understood it to mean just what the Senator from Idaho so well explained its meaning to be, for he said that necessarily the effect of this treaty upon the cost of living must be confined to food products and forest products, and he desired and intended that this treaty should reduce the price of agricultural products; and while he may not be exactly as stalwart a Republican as some from whom the Senator from Idaho has been reading, he is still a Republican and practically certain to be the



next Republican nominee, although I hardly think the next Republican President—

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Texas does not want to go any further than the nomination. If the prophecy closes there then there is little consolation in it to a Republican.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I stop at the nomination.

The Senator is about to go on without commenting on the fact that here is a Republican in a State paper, which must be called a Republican document, who does not only advocate this treaty, but gives the very reason for its passage which the Senator from Idaho so severely, and, as I think, so properly, condemns.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, my citation only went to the coming in of the present administration?

Mr. BAILEY. You stop at that?

Mr. BORAH. I stop at that. There has since arisen one who knoweth not Joseph.

Mr. BAILEY. Then Joseph will not know him when the time comes.

Mr. BORAH. I read an editorial published in the last campaign. I read only a part of it. It is from the Inter-Ocean under date of October 16, 1908, while the battle was on:

The Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, after a speaking tour through Iowa, Kansas, and Nebraska, expresses the conviction that Mr. Taft is sure of those three States. That is a matter of opinion. However, few will seriously question the accuracy of Mr. Wilson's judgment, except, possibly, with respect to Nebraska. Mr. Wilson adds: "The one thing that will hold the farmers in line for Mr. Taft is the tariff policy of the Republican Party. The farmer does not want a revision of the tariff that ultimately means free trade."

The farmer certainly never understood that there was any possibility of having free trade as to him and protection to the American manufacturer.

Mr. McKinley said in another place, if I may be permitted to go back prior to the late dispensation:

The farmer finds among the employees of protected industries his best and most reliable customers.

Is not New England worth preserving?

How long have we heard that out West?

Is not the industrial system which makes such a community of consumers for agricultural products possibly worth maintaining?

We think so. We beg you not depart.

Does not she furnish you a market worth fostering? \* \* \*

That is when we were talking to the American farmer.

The foreign market for agricultural products is one of the delusions of free trade. \* \* \* Do the agriculturists want the duties removed and their products driven from this market.

Or would they prefer to have the home market sustained and supplied by the foreign producer?

I want to quote a few more declarations from the record of the Republican Party. I quote at random from different campaign books and campaign documents, although I have all of them here upon my desk in case any special information is desired.

If by reversal of our policy the home market is destroyed, where on the face of the earth will the farmer turn to dispose of his products?

Again, and this is found in the campaign book of 1904 and previous campaign books:

The new tariff gives Canada all she wants, without surrendering anything.

This has reference to the Wilson bill, for which we severely condemned it.

Again, I find in the campaign book of 1894:

What answer can be made to the intelligent farmers of Wisconsin, who find that their potatoes are protected from the vegetable growers of Canada by a duty of 20 per cent, while the toothsome peanut of the Old Dominion is sheltered by a protection of 73 per cent.

Upon page 157 of the campaign book of 1894 you will find an exhaustive discussion of the great detriment to the American farmer of free trade with Canada and a thorough denunciation of the Democratic Party for its position on the subject. The whole matter is dealt with in detail.

Upon another campaign document used in the last three campaigns I find the following:

Why should the market for farmers' products be turned over to people who live in other countries? When the Canadian farmers and millers have thus secured free access to our markets for all they can produce, our own farmers and millers must look for a market for their products that have been displaced by Canadian products.

We have gone before the people with such argument campaign after campaign.

Speaking of the Wilson bill, in a document issued by the national Republican organization, it says:

The present law is in the interest of the stock raiser of Canada. Under the McKinley Act there was a specific duty of \$30 per head on horses valued at less than \$150 and 30 per cent ad valorem on all that were valued at \$150 or over. Now, what must be the inevitable effect of this on the American horse raiser?

And so I might proceed indefinitely.

In this connection I desire to call attention to what Mr. Laurier thinks as to what they will be able to do when they get possession of the American market. Says the premier:

We are above all an agricultural people; our chief wealth is the growth of those products of the Temperate Zone, fruits, cereals, and vegetables; and it is our boast—but a boast founded on actual experience—that in cereals, vegetables, and fruits we can, without exaggeration, beat the world. At the northern extremity of the Temperate Zone our cereals have more strength, our fruit has better flavor, our vegetables have more delicacy than similar productions from other parts of the world; and under free competition, not barred in any way by tariff legislation, they will displace all other products on the tables of the wealthy.

Where will the American farmer be when the tables of New England and the tables of the wealthy are supplied by the Canadian farmer, when the partnership is formed between the manufacturing centers of the East and the Canadian producer, and when the Canadian railroad magnate lowers his rate of freight from the point of production to the point of consumption in order to control the business of this country? Where will the western producer and the entire great Northwest be in that struggle for existence? You are not only making a partnership unknown to any principle which we have ever advocated, but by reason of the control of transportation by a government which we can not control to fix rates you may turn every dollar of the production of western Canada into the eastern market at a price which it will be impossible for the western producer to compete with.

Our object to-day is to open the door of the American market, to open the door of a nation of 90,000,000, which has been closed to us for the last 50 years.

If this tariff does not protect the American farmer, if it does not give him the home market, if it is a delusion, as has been stated, why has not the Canadian farmer come into the American market and occupied it? Could there be any more conclusive proof of its protection to the American producer than the fact that it has kept out the Canadian producer?

It would not be nearly so bad, Mr. President, if the American consumer was going to get the benefit of it. The American farmer might enter upon his ledger a debit to philanthropy if he knew the American consumer was going to get the benefit of it. But with the American markets placed in the absolute control of corporations, combines, and trusts, is anyone so deluded as to think that the price will be reduced to the consumer the value of a cent?

When we were passing the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, the East came to us with one of those pathetic pleas so characteristic of it. They said, Take the tariff off hides. Give us free hides and we will give you cheaper shoes and cheaper leather goods. They plead with western men to consent to take the tariff off hides. We were at that time collecting two and a quarter million dollars revenue upon hides. We took the tariff off hides. We lost two and a quarter million dollars to the Treasury. What as to the price of shoes and leather goods? Instead of going down, the prices went up. The two and a quarter million dollars went into the hands of the importer or manufacturer or the foreign producer.

So it will be here. By the time the wheat gets beyond the flouring mill and the steer gets beyond the Meat Trust and the other raw material reaches the table or the wearing of the American consumer, do you not think he will ever know that the reciprocity agreement has gone into effect? Perhaps he will be consoled by that philosophy which has perfumed the atmosphere of this Chamber when every other argument was exhausted, that we want to live upon the basis of brotherly love and brotherly affection with our brethren of the North.

The Premier says further:

We have in the Province of Quebec natural meadows, which require no tillage, and upon which the best of timothy has been grown, not for 50 years, but for 100 years. All along the two shores of Lake St. Peter there are natural meadows, a few inches only above the level of the water, which are yearly flooded, and which, to the knowledge of everyone in the Province, have been for a hundred years or more growing hay and nothing else. The counties of Berthier, Montmorency, and St. Maurice, on the north shore, and the counties of Nicolet, Yamaska, and Richelieu on the south, are so situated that they have a very considerable population who are growers of hay and for whom this treaty, if it becomes law, will be a most positive boon.

How will it be a positive boon to the Canadian producer unless it is a positive injury to the American producer, when both are engaged in the same business, applying for the same market, and selling the same products? Again, we come back to the proposition of living in a rarified state of brotherly affection with the brethren on the north.

To-day they can not sell any hay in the United States because there is a duty of \$4 a ton.

Yet we find men upon this side of the Republican line so exhilarated by that feeling of brotherly affection that they say protection does not protect the American farmer. What does



the Premier of Canada think about it? What does the Canadian farmer think about it? What does the actual practical experience of 50 years show in regard to it?

Let the duty be removed, and then immediately there will be an immense trade in that section of the community, as there was some 30 years ago. The same thing applies in the case of eggs, poultry, and mining products. For this reason it is to our advantage that we should have not only the British market but the American market also.

This agreement is concerned chiefly with natural products. There are no manufactured products dealt with in this agreement except agricultural implements. There is a vast difference between reciprocity in natural products and reciprocity in manufactured goods.

It would not appear necessary to say that, it would seem, on the part of the premier if he had not, perhaps, observed such intellectual obtuseness upon this side of the line in regard to that question:

This is the reason we have acted with this prudence. I do not know who was present at the conference which took place between our two representatives and Mr. Knox, but it is not a great effort of imagination to suppose that the Americans were far more concerned about obtaining reciprocity in manufactured products than they were in natural products.

In calling the proposed trade agreement reciprocity it is introduced favorably to thousands of people upon the assumption that the agreement involves the principle of reciprocity as advocated by Mr. Blaine and ex-President McKinley. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is the very reverse of the principle as announced by those distinguished advocates of this economic policy. They would exchange noncompetitive products, and those alone. This provides for the exchange of competitive products, and those alone. The farmer's strongest and most successful competitor is given free access to our market and the farm products of our own country must be brought into direct competition with the farm products of Canada. This principle Blaine condemned in no uncertain terms. He not only condemned the principle, but he condemned the specific proposition of reciprocity with Canada. It was his theory that all competitive products should carry a duty and that those things which we do not produce, and those only, should come in free under any reciprocity agreement. His policy was in direct aid of the protective theory—this policy is a direct attack upon the protective theory. It is not even tariff for revenue. We are so anxious to get at the American farmer that we will not give him the benefit of the incidental protection derived from a tariff for revenue only. In that respect it is just as much opposed to the Democratic principle as it is to the Republican principle.

So as to him there is applied the doctrine of absolute free trade, a doctrine which both Democrats and Republicans have either abandoned or denounced. No one in this day and age thinks free trade is a proper policy, but nevertheless we are placing the American farmer under the direct application of the doctrine of free trade. If we should apply the doctrine to all industries that we are now applying to the farming industry, this Government would not have revenue enough to pay expenses. If we should adopt the policy with reference to all industries that we are now applying to the agricultural industries, we would positively be without means of running the Government. It would not be so bad if we would hold on to the doctrine of tariff for revenue only. Then the farmer might get the benefit of incidental protection. But both parties with unseemly haste and with inconsiderate judgment have proceeded to apply a principle to the American farmer which everyone admits if applied to all would be destructive of the entire revenue system of government.

I call attention to some of the reciprocity announcements by former leaders of that policy. John Sherman said:

To grant to foreign nations the reciprocal right of free importation into our ports of articles which we can not produce in return for free introduction into foreign ports of articles of American production is reciprocity.

The platform of the Republican Party in 1900 read:

We favor the associated policy of reciprocity, so directed as to open our markets on favorable terms for what we do not ourselves produce in return for free foreign markets.

Mr. McKinley, in his inaugural address, said:

The end in view must always be the opening up of new markets for the products of our country by granting concessions to the products of other lands that we need and can not produce ourselves and which do not involve any loss of labor to our people, but tend to increase their employment.

In his Buffalo speech McKinley said:

By sensible trade arrangements which will not interrupt home production we shall extend the outlet of our increasing surplus.

We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor.

In the last campaign, in 1908, we circulated a campaign document containing this paragraph:

But so-called "reciprocity" in competing articles is a delusion and a snare. It necessarily and unavoidably means two things—either that we hand the other country a gold brick or that we abandon protection. The former would not be right, and the latter would not be wise. So we are unequivocally against it on both grounds.

That is the declaration upon which we were elected and upon which we came into power.

Again, I quote from the Republican Campaign Book:

Republican reciprocity is reciprocity in noncompeting articles, and nothing else.

President Arthur, in his annual message in 1884, said:

A series of reciprocal treaties with countries of America which shall foster between us and them an unhampered movement of trade. The conditions of these treaties should be the free admission of such merchandise as this country does not produce in return for the admission free or under a favored scheme of duties of our own products.

Again, I quote from the campaign book:

The American farmer objects to reciprocity restricted to natural products only. With good reason he objects to having all of the Canadian surplus of grain dumped on the American market. He knows that to remove the Canadian tariff from Canadian cereals would not only be disadvantageous to his interests now, but would in the near future help to build up a competition overwhelming in its magnitude.

There, Mr. President, is the broad, clear, distinct, emphatic proposition given to the constituency which placed the present administration in power. Who has been to the Isle of Patmos since that occurred, and where did this new revelation come from? If the Republican Party had the boldness and the courage to say that it has been in error, that protection does not protect the farmer, that it was an economic mistake, that would be one thing. But we are not meeting the proposition by undertaking to show that the policy which we have been advocating for 30 or 40 years is founded, as a matter of fact, upon a fallacy, but we are seeking by diaphanous argument to undertake to defend our position with the attitude of all the days that have gone by. We are undertaking to show that these things are capable of two constructions, when the language used is so plain and direct and so emphatic that it is impossible to misunderstand it.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Roor] said the other day that the American farmer was unduly apprehensive of the injury which he might sustain. Who made the American farmer unduly apprehensive? How did he get his fear? How long has it taken us to convince him that he should be unduly apprehensive, and whose business is it to know whether his undue apprehensiveness is based upon fact or fallacy?

The time was in this Chamber, Mr. President, not very long ago, when the American farmer was not disputed with as to whether or not this kind of a policy would injure him. The very moment that he came into this Senate Chamber every Republican leader was quick to act as his advocate and defend his cause. But now, perchance because the farmer sees fit to call in the aid of a New York attorney to gather facts and present the statistics to the Republican Finance Committee, he is to be denounced from one end of the country to the other as acting in conjunction with trusts and combines and undesirable persons of all classes.

We have been the representative, the advocate, and the defender of the agricultural interests upon this floor for 40 years, and it never occurred to the American farmer before that until the whole fabric of the protective tariff system was torn down he would be taken out and placed outside of the system of protection. There has not been a note of warning sounded to him. No man would have dared to have gone into the last campaign and submitted to the voters of this country the proposition which is now before us. That proposition could not have been outlined or brought into this Chamber after any discussion before the American public. But it is here, without notice, without warning, without chance for amendment, on a simple hearing before a committee already bound to report the measure.

Finally, sir, let me say that one-half of the agricultural lands now in private ownership are not under cultivation. We can double our production. We have at least 75,000,000 acres of new lands well fitted for cultivation. We have at least 10,000,000 acres of swamp land, the richest in the world. We have yet several millions of arid lands. By proper farming, not to say scientific farming, we can double the acreage productive-ness of our soil. We have the soil and the capacity to supply products for 250,000,000 people. Why quit this field and seek help from abroad? By attending to our agricultural interests at home we make new farms, new homes, more property to bear the burdens of taxation, and, moreover, we really shield



our political institutions. To facilitate and encourage the food supply at home, to augment and encourage the agricultural interests of a people, is the highest statesmanship of these days.

The first symptoms of an approaching aristocracy is an attempt to discriminate against or a contemptuous neglect of the agricultural interests. The line that divides the period of strength, virility, and power from the period of luxury, weakness, corruption, and decay in the history of every great country is that which marks the neglect of the agricultural interests. An abandoned farm ought to cause more distress and worry to the statesmen than bad laws or unwise policies. An abandoned farm is a menace to our national institutions and a standing indictment against the wisdom of our national policies. The home market without the presence of the farmer is a foreign market. Think of a home market with a foreigner in possession of it. And the premier says he will take possession of it under this agreement. Think of the family fireside with the eldest boy, who has worked longest and hardest and waited most patiently to share the comforts of industry and frugality, turned aside and some "Weary Willie," or brother tramp, who never expended a dollar for the old home, in his place. This may be economy, but it is both immoral and unpatriotic.

Mr. HEYBURN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 29, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, June 29, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of the Christian Endeavor Union of Boston, Mass.; of the National Conference of Charities and Correction and of the Business Men's Association of New Haven, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the First Seventh-day Adventist Church of Springfield, Ill., and memorials of sundry citizens of Princeton, Ill., remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented memorials of Local Grange of Hooksett; of Bear Hill Grange, of Henniker; and of Montcalm Grange, No. 70, of Enfield, all of the Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Claremont, N. H., praying for an extension of time within which the appropriation for the purchase of forest lands in the White Mountains is available, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FLETCHER presented resolutions adopted by the Cotton Crushers' Association, praying for the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the City Council of Key West, Fla., praying for the cooperation of the United States Government at the Oversea Railroad celebration, to be held at Key West, Fla., which were presented to the Committee on Railroads.

Mr. BURTON presented a petition of sundry citizens, of Typographical Union No. 63, and of the Central Labor Union, of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the adoption of the proposed constitution of the Territory of Arizona, which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. LIPPITT presented resolutions adopted by the Republican Club of Greystone, R. I., favoring a political union between the United States and Canada, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Lincoln, Nebr., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called corporation-tax law permitting corporations to make returns at the end of their fiscal years, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of Local Division No. 2, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Norwich, Conn., remon-

strating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of New Haven, Conn., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. GUGGENHEIM presented a memorial of the County Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Denver County, Colo., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### GOVERNMENT OF PORTUGAL.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, in the early part of the session, two or three months ago, I presented a resolution on the subject of the recognition of the establishment of a republic in Portugal, and had the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. No report has ever been made by that committee and, so far as I know or have been advised, no attention has been paid to the resolution. Nevertheless, I am glad to say that the executive department of the United States has finally recognized officially the Republic of Portugal, as shown by the cablegram which I ask may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without reading?

Mr. CULBERSON. Without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES PORTUGAL—REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT OF LAND FORMERLY RULED BY MANUEL IS UPHOLD.

LISBON, June 19, 1911.

The United States has officially recognized the Republic of Portugal. This followed the opening of the new constituent assembly this morning, at which the president of the chamber read a decree proclaiming the abolition of the monarchy and the banishment from Portugal of the royal family of Braganza, which was unanimously approved. The decree was also read by the president to the great throngs which gathered outside the assembly building.

George J. Lorillard, American chargé d'affaires, in the afternoon waited upon Sr. MacAdoo, minister of foreign affairs, and delivered a note which stated the United States officially recognizes the new Portuguese Government.

The day was observed as a public holiday throughout the whole country. Popular demonstrations in honor of the occasion were held everywhere, but no disorders are reported.

### TREATY OF 1832 WITH RUSSIA.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has treated another resolution which I introduced and had referred to the committee with the same inaction and inattention, so far as I know. On the 10th of April I reintroduced a resolution on the subject of the treaty between this country and Russia of 1832 which I introduced at the last session. After that I addressed a communication to the chairman of the committee calling his attention to the resolution and asking him the privilege of being heard by the committee when the matter was taken up. I had a courteous reply, saying in effect that I would be offered this privilege, but up to this time nothing further has been done, so far as I am advised, with reference to the resolution.

I wish to take advantage of this occasion to say that that resolution was introduced in good faith, that it means what it says, and that I trust I will not be placed in the disagreeable attitude of being compelled to move to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution and bringing it before the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, in harmony with the remarks just made by the Senator from Texas, on a question that is of vital importance to the American Republic and of infinite importance as well to a great religious sect in our country, I ask permission to read the following editorial from the New York Evening Mail of Friday, June 23, 1911:

#### THE JEW AND THE FLAG.

It can not be that the cool minds in the Russian Government realize the danger in their attitude toward the American citizen who is a Jew. Can we express it, in all its splendid power that it has here, and not seem to Russia extravagant in language? The root idea of this Republic is absolute equality before the law. There is no other doctrine, in all our constitutional concept, that is comparable with this one doctrine. It is our life nerve. It is our very heartbeat.

Therefore the flag protects every law-abiding American the wide world over. The flag knows no Jew. It only knows the American citizen. The flag never reasons beyond that. Is he an American citizen? On every sea, as on every home village green, the flag means the same. Are we understood?

To understand us is a momentous thing. To understand us means taking account of our national spirit, of which it may not become us to boast. Yet the world pretty well understands it now—except possibly Russia. To understand us one needs to count our resources of